

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1876.

## The Week.

THE Senate has finished the Belknap case in a way which will be satisfactory to nobody except Belknap and his counsel. They have certainly succeeded in making the "High Court" and all its surroundings so ridiculous that impeachment is not likely to be resorted to again for a long time. On the first article the vote stood 35 to 25, the latter being almost a strict party vote, and turning, not at all on the question of guilt and innocence, but on that of jurisdiction, which the Senate had already definitively decided. When we recollect that only five months ago Belknap in shame and humiliation confessed his guilt and resigned from the Cabinet in disgrace; that the evidence of bribery consisted in proof of the direct and periodic payment to him of money by a man to whom he had given an office; that a majority of the Senate voted that the court had jurisdiction; and that a majority voted again that he was guilty, his escape is a simple mockery. It is worth while to notice, perhaps, that every lawyer of any standing voted "guilty" except, we regret to say, Judge Christiancy, and our great jurist Mr. Conkling, who, as each article was voted on, came out with a burst of rhetoric, such as "forced by the order of a bare majority"; "this being the first attempt in our history to stretch the political power of impeachment"; "Joseph Story and every other commentator on the Constitution," etc., etc, evidently mistaking the occasion for one of solemn historic interest. All the proceedings were thoroughly *bouffe*, and they could hardly have been made more so by music and a dance by all the company at the end. As it was, they terminated very well by a letter from Mr. G. F. Hoar, who conclusively refuted the charge made by Judge Black that his brother, Judge Hoar, had given a library of "costly literature" to the President. On the whole, though it is a great shame that Belknap should have got off in this way, we do not so much regret the farcical termination of the affair. For rascals like him—and he is a type of the rascals of the day in politics—trials by "High Courts," presided over by Senators, and opened with prayer, are altogether too pompous. The place for them is the dock of a criminal court, and the proper form of procedure a common indictment for crime, and the proper body to try them a common jury. It remains to note the fact that but one Democrat voted for acquittal, while Mr. Morton voted to convict, having, we are sure, an abounding sense of the folly of giving to his opponents in the coming Presidential campaign such a deadly weapon as the discharge of Belknap by his own party.

Bluford Wilson's testimony before the Whiskey Trial Committee does nothing more than to confirm the prevailing popular impression as to the relations of the President to the prosecutions; but its revelations of intrigue, corruption, servility, and lying in "Administration circles" at Washington make up such an exhibition as has never before been presented to the public. The testimony does not involve the President in the whiskey frauds, but it shows that the moment suspicion fell on Babcock the hostility of the President was aroused, and from that time his main interest in the case seems to have been to hamper the prosecution in every way possible. The evidence on this point is very strong, consisting as it does of proof of a series of acts, each one of which in itself might be of little consequence, but which taken together can only mean one thing. Thus, it seems that within an hour of the time when Wilson told the President that he had testimony to show that \$500 had been mailed from St. Louis to Babcock, Babcock knew of it; that Babcock told Wilson that anything said to the President

was as good as told him; that the President ordered the Attorney-General against his inclination to write his circular letter forbidding the use of accomplices' testimony; that the President had recommended that Bell, the detective, should go to St. Louis as a spy on the prosecution, with orders to report directly to the Attorney-General; that Henderson, the Government counsel, was removed by the President's orders just before the Babcock trial, in the face of a positive statement from the Judge of the United States Court that he had said nothing reflecting on the President, and in the face also of a prediction by all interested in the prosecutions that the dismissal would seriously interfere with the interests of the Government; and, finally, we find the President much chagrined at the refusal of the legal officers of the Government to turn over all the evidence in the case to a military court.

The explanation of the "Sylph" despatch is perhaps one of the most significant things in the testimony. Wilson says that General Porter, a close friend of the President, told him that "Sylph" was the name of a disreputable woman who had been trying to blackmail the President, and that Babcock and he had done him the favor to get rid of her, and that afterwards these funny dogs used to call each other "Sylph"; that this story was impatiently denied by the President; and that, instead of showing any indignation with Porter, he remained on the same friendly terms with him as before. With regard to Babcock, it appears that all the evidence tending to criminate him endeared him to General Grant until it turned out that Babcock had been involved in some way in the Black Friday business, and had made an assignment of his property to Gardner, who also happened to be the judge-advocate of the military court into whose possession the conspirators wanted to get all the papers. On this General Grant lost confidence in him. Perhaps the most curious part of the whole business is the evident suspicion on the part of the President, which the conspirators did their best to foster, that the whiskey prosecutions were part of a deep-laid scheme to ruin the Administration and make Mr. Bristow President. One of the best dodges resorted to was the fraudulent insertion of a reference to the White House in one of Wilson's letters, making it appear that he was trying to catch the President. This was shown to General Porter (by the press copy of the letter) to be a forgery, but the General, who is not a man to be easily convinced, reported the exposure to the President as a "claim" on Wilson's part that it was a forgery. As a fitting supplement to these scandals, the friends of Mr. Wilson are publishing the contents of some valuable papers which he has in his possession (notwithstanding an attempt, as the late Mr. J. Fisk, jr., would have put it, to "rescue" them), from one of which it appears that the cause of Attorney-General Williams's retirement from the Cabinet was the discovery that a number of blackmailing letters which had been sent to the President and various members of his family and Cabinet had been partly concocted by Whiteley, who, after being discharged by the Government, had been given employment by Mr. Williams, and partly by some one whose name is not given, but who is understood to be closely related to the ex-Attorney-General by blood or by marriage.

Mr. Schurz has written a long letter to the New York *Staats-Zeitung* in defence of himself against certain strictures of that paper on his course in supporting Hayes and Wheeler. He makes a historical comparison of the conduct of the two parties with regard to the leading questions of the day, showing, for instance, that although there are inflationists in the ranks of both, nevertheless, active support for the policy of resumption has only come from the Republicans, and its strongest advocates are to be found amongst them; that although the Republicans have not reformed the civil service, they have shown more disposition to do so than

the Democrats, whose recent dealing with this subject when they have had the opportunity, as in the case of the officers of the House of Representatives, has been deplorable, while the only sign of interest in it has come from Senator Gordon and Mr. Clarkson Potter; and he draws a somewhat dismal, and we think too highly-charged, picture of the effect of Mr. Tilden's election in stimulating disorder at the South. Our own solemn belief is that the less said on this point on the Republican side, the better; that the "outrage" argument serves and can serve the purpose of nobody in this canvass but the Republican knaves; and that the probabilities are that the South will be more peaceful under Tilden than under Hayes, and this for reasons which lie on the surface. Tilden is not a weak or foolish man. He will have no motive for tolerating disorders at the South, nor will his leading followers. On the contrary, they will perceive clearly the importance of tranquillity in that region to the stability of their hold in power at the North, while these disorders will actually constitute nearly the whole political capital of the Republican Conklings, Mortons, Chandlers, and Cornells, with whose support Hayes is, it seems, to be saddled. On this matter we hope reformers, even when supporting Hayes, will not lose their heads. If we elect Hayes on the "bloody shirt" theory, we are delivered bound hand and foot to the disreputable gang for whose overthrow we have been so long laboring.

The President has signed the Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill, accompanying his signature with a message expressing his dissatisfaction with many of the reductions effected, and generally with the insufficiency of the total amount. He has also sent a message to the Senate relating to the Hamburg massacre, which does not add much to our knowledge of the subject, and is objectionable on account of its vagueness and the loose references to the condition of Louisiana and Mississippi. General Grant is undoubtedly right in saying that "how long these things are to continue, and what is to be the final remedy, the Great Ruler of the universe only knows"; but there is one thing that we are perfectly confident of—that the remedy will not be through interference in South Carolina because negroes are killed in Mississippi, or *vice versa*. Warrants of arrest have been issued against eighty-seven persons concerned in the Hamburg massacre, and they will unquestionably be tried and punished for their crimes in the ordinary course of law.

The "inside of politics" in this State is just now in a very curious condition. It is generally conceded, or at all events there is strong reason for believing, that New York will be the crucial State in the next Presidential election, and that whichever of the two candidates gets it will win. The nomination for the Governorship is, therefore, of considerable importance for its effect on the public mind. If the Republicans should put up a machine candidate, after all that has happened, it is safe to say it would be all over with them. If they, on the other hand, put up a man of real eminence for character and ability, it would do a good deal to counteract the unfavorable impression created by the continued retention of Chandler, Cornell, and their like in charge of the engine-room. But it seems that Mr. Conkling's soul is filled with rage and bitterness over the events at Cincinnati. When he thinks that Cornell went out with a powerful body of henchmen and a band of music, and offered the Convention a choice of nominating the "Favorite Son" of New York, the great orator, great thinker, great legislator, the peerless beauty of the party, and that he got hardly any votes outside his own Custom-house delegates, he feels that dark days are in store for his country, and vows vengeance. Accordingly, his plan is to nominate Cornell, and, if he cannot elect him, at least to clasp his enemies round the waist and roll over the precipice with them to common ruin.

Accordingly, the "machine" has been put in motion for Cornell, while the reformers under Mr. Curtis are trying to secure the nomination of Mr. Evarts, who certainly would arouse as near an approach to enthusiasm among its best men as so many years of Conkling and Cornell have left in the party. How the conflict will end it is

as yet difficult to say, but there is no difficulty in predicting the result of Cornell's nomination. It will be a repetition of that of the great Conkling movement at Cincinnati. If any one wants to know how the machine works, he will find it in an account, in the *New York Times* of July 30, of the election of delegates to the Convention at Newburg from the First Assembly District. He will there see that "Jerry" Drew, a Custom-house weigher, was on the ground for many days "fixing the primaries"—that is, getting them ready for the "men of property and education" when they came "to attend to their political duties," and that Jerry "fixed" them so well that before the Convention met he had thirty out of forty-five delegates pledged to Cornell. At the Convention Jerry was likewise "on hand" and "fixed things" again, so that Cornell delegates to the State Convention were all chosen. He had in it all a select band of "co-workers," composed mainly of Custom-house officers. Now, look at Jerry's history. When the war broke out he was a guard at Sing Sing, then he became a harbor-master, and when General Grant came into power entered the Custom-house, and now has charge of the Conkling interest in the Highlands, where he has been a noted and able wire-puller for many years. If you asked Jerry what the great political evil of the day was, he would reply, with tears in his voice, "The condition of the South, sir; nothing but this to trouble any patriotic man. Oh, sir, when I think of the way the poor niggers down there are treated it makes my blood boil; and, mark my words, bad as it is now, if Tilden is elected we shall see far worse things. Why, sir, I know him well—have known him these thirty years. If that old huckster gets into the White House, the whole South will be a regular Siege of Jerusalem in three months." And then he will wipe his eyes and write a letter to Cornell telling him "how things are looking."

Strenuous efforts have been made during the week by the representatives of the Bonanza mine-owners, and by their inflation allies, to force through the House of Representatives some one of the bills which would secure the Government an unlimited buyer of silver and, at the same time, increase the volume of currency. None of these efforts has met with success, although they have come so near it as to create apprehension, and to make it certain that at the next session of Congress the forces of the silver-mine owners, the inflationists, and the repudiationists will be massed to effect what cannot now be accomplished for want of time. If it were not a serious matter, it would be amusing to witness the zeal with which the worshippers of the "greenback," now that they discover a cheaper money in silver, rally around the silver standard. So long as the silver dollar was as good as the gold dollar they spurned it, but no sooner do they see that the depreciation of silver makes it worth less than the greenback than they become "bullionists" with a vengeance. At present writing, it seems likely that a commission will be authorized, something like the Parliamentary Committee of which Mr. Goschen was chairman, to collect facts respecting silver and the restoration of the double standard by the United States, and to confer with other nations which have the double standard, with the view of obtaining united action. If such a committee does its work properly, their report will be useful in guiding Congress at its next session and in shaping public sentiment as well. The belief in London, founded on despatches from this side, that Congress would, before adjourning, re-establish the double standard, and besides authorize the Government to receive all the silver bullion deposited with it, imparted strength to the market for silver, and the price advanced as high as 51½*d.* per ounce. With the changed tenor of advices as to Washington legislation the price fell back to 50*d.*, and the market at that was only nominal. If the "silver dollar of our fathers" had been in existence, the changes in its gold value during the week would have been from 84¼ cents to 86½ cents and back to 84½ cents; the promise of the United States to pay a dollar (the legal-tender note) has ranged during the week between 89 and 89½ cents.

If the Republicans, instead of wasting so much time in exposing the inflation and repudiation tendencies of the Democrats, had di-



rected their energies for the past ten or fifteen years towards actual resumption, we should not now be in the unpleasant quandary of having an act on the statute-book destined to bring it about on a given day, without any "supplemental" legislation to carry it out. At the present session of Congress, of course, nothing will be done; and no matter which way the election goes this fall, the present Congress has another session which begins next December and lasts till March, 1877. This postpones all effective action till that time; and if the Republicans are victorious this fall, the first meeting of a Congress in full sympathy with the Act of 1875 will be in December, 1877, or thirteen months from the day actually fixed for resumption. Judging the future by the past or by the present, it is safe to say that no scheme of contraction or violent attempt to bring about a restoration of paper to a par in thirteen months will be tolerated by the politicians of either party; and even if Mr. Hayes's Secretary of the Treasury were to begin operations of his own motion, as under the Act he is entitled to, he would only have twenty months to resume in. If the Republicans, when they fixed the 1st of January, 1879, as the day for resumption, had adopted a well-defined and carefully-matured policy on the subject, the work might by this time have been half done. But, instead of that, they passed an act which meant contraction to one party, inflation to another, and left the matter in such a position as to be at the mercy of the first hostile House of Representatives. We have no doubt that Mr. Hayes earnestly desires a speedy return to specie payments; but, even if he is elected, it must be remembered that it is through Congress that resumption or inflation must come, and Congress is likely in 1877 to be composed of very much the same timber that it was in 1875.

The *Christian Intelligencer* finds fault with some of our recent strictures on the government of the Indians by what we called the missionary expedient. It says, we presume speaking with authority, that Mr. E. P. Smith must not be regarded as "the most prominent representative" of this system, and that his removal did not indicate its failure, but was due to "his too great intimacy with contractors and others who preyed on the Government and the Indian," and it adds that it was Smith, one of the Indian Commissioners, who, "after his removal was determined on, proposed to turn over the Cheyennes and Arapahoes to the military"; that it was "when Mr. Smith and his friends found they could no longer run the Indian Bureau that they became willing and anxious to have it turned over to the War Department." We surrender Smith and likewise Delano to the *Intelligencer's* indignation, but when it goes on to ask us "how we can consistently favor turning over [the Indian Bureau or] any branch of the civil government to the army," and, "if army government is so good for the Indian, why not try it on" the Post-office Department, the Treasury Department, and the collection of Customs? it places itself in our hands and must submit to impalement. We have discussed this subject fully in the *Nation*, and if the editor of the *Intelligencer* has done us the honor to read what we have said on the subject, he must be aware that we advocated the transfer of the Indian affairs to the army officers not because they were soldiers, but because they were the only trained and responsible servants the Government had possessing any familiarity with Indian affairs. We held that the Indian Bureau ought itself to be made up of civilians as capable, as honorable, and as experienced as the army officers, and that, failing such a Bureau, the army was the next best resort, and that it was ridiculous to pass the army by and go to the missionaries; for, said we, (No. 527)—and here the process of impalement begins—if the missionaries are the proper persons to administer our Indian affairs, are they not also the proper persons to administer the Treasury and the Post-office and the Custom-house? In fact, the *Intelligencer* has taken our illustration and given it a little twist which it will not bear. Restoring it to its original position, it will be seen that while we propose the transfer of an important branch of the Government service to an able and highly serviceable corps of Government servants, the *Intelligencer* proposes its transfer to a body of volunteers who

only special qualification is their piety; and that while the transfer of the Custom-house and the Post-office and Treasury to the army officers would, we have no doubt, produce excellent results, their transfer to missionaries as such would be both ridiculous and ruinous.

The Pope has been making an extraordinary address to the Sacred College on the occasion of the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of his accession to the Pontificate, in which he dwelt strongly on the example of Tobias, who, when carried into slavery, did not abandon himself to grief, but kept a stout heart, till Sennacherib was killed by his own sons and the virtuous Tobias was enabled to return home; and His Holiness called the particular attention of the Cardinals to the fact that when he got back he recovered all the "rich possessions" which were his before he was carried off, and assured them "that the Church must triumph and the Revolution perish"; "that the fathers would kill the sons, the sons would kill their fathers, and all those born of the Revolution would devour each other"—which is a very unpleasant prophecy or suggestion as to what is to happen or ought to happen, and is capable of a somewhat repulsively literal interpretation. He threw some light on the kind of comfort he drew from the case of Tobias afterwards in his remarks to a deputation of the Roman nobility, when he pointed out that the humiliation of France and Austria by Germany was due to their having, though Catholic powers, successively abandoned the Holy See, and that the late Sultan lost his reason and committed suicide owing to his having "taken upon himself the protection of a handful of schismatics in the East." He said he would not speak of "the fearful punishments with which God had specially stricken now one and now another of the impious sectarians, dying in terror and fright and abandoned to the powers of infernal darkness"; but he would mention one little fact. He then told how Ratazzi, one of the leaders of the Revolution, having called in a priest in his dying hour, the priest was prevented by "a barricade" of infidels from getting to the sick man's bedside, and was told "that he would be called when there was need." In the meantime, Ratazzi died, and His Holiness evidently has no doubt about his present situation. These were pleasant little stories for a great ecclesiastical festival.

Except in a single quarter, the Servians have been on the defensive during the week, and the Turks have succeeded in entering their territory at several points—from Nissa, if we may credit the report; on the lower Timok, under Suleiman Pasha, who, after routing the Servians, took up his march for Radujevatz; and, to the south of Saitshar, by way of Gramada, under Hafiz Pasha. These simultaneous movements took place on Saturday. The next day Hafiz Pasha was joined by Ahmed Pasha at Derbent, and together they captured the place, thus getting between General Leshjanin and Alexinatz, and making it impracticable for Tcherniaeff to go to his relief by way of Kujazevatz, which is now besieged. Meantime, General Antitch, whose objective appears to be the only remaining route for Turkish supplies to Bosnia, it said to have "completely defeated" Dervish Pasha, coming to the relief of Sienitza, and to have invested this post, shutting up Mehemet Ali Pasha. This success, for such it appears to be as far as it goes, would have much greater importance if the Montenegrins were on hand to complete the blockade of the Bosnian approaches. They have, however, had their hands fully employed in an opposite direction by Mukhtar Pasha, who began by defeating them with heavy loss near Nevesinje, and then followed them up as they retreated, apparently demoralized, toward their own frontier. On the 28th he attacked them with seeming advantage near Urbiza, when the tables were suddenly turned, the Turkish lines pierced, and the force nearly destroyed. Selim Pasha was killed, Osman Pasha (not he of Saitshar) taken prisoner, and guns and flags in large numbers fell as spoils to the victors. Mukhtar Pasha, with the remnant of his panic-stricken army, made his way to Bilek, but, not choosing to make a stand there, retreated to Trebinje. The fighting about Podgoritza, on the southern frontier of Montenegro, continues unfavorable to the Turks; but the town is still in their possession.

## THE ONE-TERM GUARANTEE.

THERE is probably no subject on which Mr. Tilden is more puzzled what to say in his letter of acceptance than that of a second term. Mr. Hayes's utterances on this matter make it very difficult for a rival candidate to deal with it. If what Mr. Hayes has said was a good thing to say, it would seem necessary for his competitor to say it too; but is not the offer of such a pledge, immediately after a rival has offered it, and perhaps almost in his very words, likely to bear an air of insincerity or even demagoguery? On the other hand, if Mr. Tilden says nothing about it at all, will he not furnish materials for many a scathing article and speech, showing up his unholy ambition and his determination to use the Government patronage to prolong or even perpetuate his hold on power? Will it not be produced as an unmistakable indication of what "Sammy's" professions of a desire for civil-service reform really amount to?

We, for our part, inasmuch as we desire to have both candidates as good and presentable as possible, as our best protection against the Republican "machine," regret that Mr. Hayes thought it necessary or desirable to offer any pledge as to the number of terms he would serve, and trust that Mr. Tilden will not follow his example. Indeed, we have no doubt that the value of the promises made by the former with regard to civil-service reform are weakened and not strengthened by his declaration against a second term. In other words, we believe that the President who is to reform the Administration must be not only free but willing to serve a second term, if desirable, and we cannot help considering Mr. Hayes's haste in binding himself a sign that he somewhat underestimates the difficulty of the task with which he has offered to charge himself. We shall be by no means sorry if, in the course of his canvass, he can find the means of relieving himself from his promise. Nobody seriously believes that he will receive any support from Congress, at the outset of his Administration, in restoring to the Executive the constitutional control of the civil-service. On the contrary, there is hardly a doubt that he will meet with a bitter and determined opposition, and that it will only be the second Congress of his term, and probably, as Mr. Schurz suggests in his letter to the *Staats-Zeitung*, only after an appeal to the people through the elections, which will give the proposed reforms even a lukewarm support. In fact, we do not see how, in even the most sanguine view of the future, Mr. Hayes can look for anything more than a beginning of his work before the third year of his term. And it is a work in which the beginning is after all but little, because even after the President had triumphed in his refusal to make removals except for good cause, or to admit Congressional influence in the distribution of the patronage, the change would have no character of permanence and security until it had taken root in public opinion—until, in short, the people had once more become sufficiently familiar with the application of business principles to Government work to look on it in the natural order of things, and anything else as too absurd to be thought of. As long as Congressmen and machine politicians felt that the reform had not taken hold of the popular mind, and was not yet looked upon as a true and integral part of the American system of government, but rested simply on the President's will, the one-term pledge would be a source of the utmost comfort to them. They would say, and with much show of reason, "We have evidently made a mistake in Hayes; we supposed that stuff in his letter about 'civil-service reform' was like the stuff which we used to put in the platforms—mere buncombe. He has, however, apparently taken the whole thing in dead earnest, and is disorganizing the party with his theories and nonsense. Luckily, however, he has pledged himself to go out anyhow in four years. It will not need very great skill to prevent his doing much mischief before then. A little passive resistance, or, better still, sham acquiescence, will keep him from getting too much excited, and when the next Convention meets we shall be wiser than we were at the last. But, blow us if we ever vote for a man again who doesn't understand 'politics' and has his head filled with imported monarchical fancies."

The fact is that it is difficult to see how our present Administrative abuses are to be cured permanently in less than ten or fifteen years. Before we can feel sure that the Government will hereafter be conducted on business principles, a generation will have to grow up and come into control of it which has never had any direct knowledge of the "spoils system," and has lost the Jacksonian tradition that the revenues of a nation may be properly collected or spent on a plan which would ruin a banker or merchant in a year; and which will laugh as heartily when anybody proposes to change the employés in the Custom-house after election as Brown Bros. would laugh if they were called upon, once in four years, to make "a new deal" of all their clerkships, without any reference to its probable effect on their profits. The strength of the present abuses, in short, does not lie wholly either in Presidential or Congressional connivance, but in the widespread and deep-seated popular delusion that Government business differs from private business, and need not be transacted on the same principles or by the same rules; and reform will not be achieved until a reforming President has not only overthrown Congress, but shown the people the more excellent way, and familiarized them with the facts that "government of the people, by the people, for the people," properly means government carried on by competent and honest book-keepers, cashiers, collectors, whose accounts balance and whose characters will bear inspection, and who are surrounded by the ordinary securities against temptation. It is not a mystic system, in which a body of noble and heroic men and women, after forming the loftiest ideals for themselves and their posterity, may collect a large army of thieves, liars, bankrupts, and broken-down people, and, handing over to them their funds and books of account and machinery of criminal justice and all their affairs, then show the world the spectacle of a pure and puissant national life; and then laugh and make merry when their employés begin to cheat, embezzle, call names, and get drunk, make false entries in the ledger, and sell the public stores to the junk-dealers, calling them "spoils," and blackguarding the European monarchs, all the while rotating in and out of office under an arrangement of their own making.

As matters now stand, the reform cannot be established in four years. We wish we thought it could be in eight, but in eight, at all events, it would be fairly out of danger. The reliance of politicians on the "machine" would have been broken up. Many of the old hands who were most skilled in working it would be dead or have betaken themselves to some other pursuit; and the public would be getting used to the new order of things and have laid hold of a higher ideal of republican government; and the chances of another reforming President would be greatly increased. At the end of four years we think not unlikely that the reactionary influences will be still strong, and there will be most of the minor objections to a change of Presidents which existed in 1864. So that a second term may be in the highest degree desirable, and it ought to be within the reach of the public, particularly as the public will be under no obligation to resort to it. If Mr. Hayes should turn out well, the country will want him longer; but if he should not, it would not be compelled to keep him. If he carries out his promises with regard to civil-service reform, he will be just as necessary to reform in 1881 as he is now, possibly more so. Indeed, any offer of a single term as a guarantee of reform shows a somewhat inadequate conception of the nature of the thing to be reformed. The great scandals of Grant's Administration, for instance, have not been due to his own desire to keep in office, but to a desire to keep Logan or Morton or Conkling or Spencer or Cameron in office, or to do whatever these illustrious men told him was necessary for "the good of the party." The very changes he is making now, which are causing so much consternation in the Republican camp, have nothing to do with a second term. He has no longer any hope of a second term, and yet he is dismissing Cabinet ministers and other valuable officers as if they were scullery-maids, simply because he is provoked and angry. His successor might act in just the same manner, and his vow not to serve twice would offer no protection against it.



## BELLIGERENTS AND NEUTRALS.

WE have frequently had occasion to express the opinion in these columns that one of these days there might be reason to regret our hasty reversal of the traditional policy of the United States as a neutral power in our dispute with England over the *Alabama* claims. For a country, sure in the long run to occupy the position of neutral in nine cases out of ten, to be very ingenious in either inventing or promulgating rules of law doubtful in meaning and difficult of application, but framed solely in the interests of belligerents and calculated to make the position of neutrals in time of war more embarrassing than it even naturally is, has always seemed to us a great sacrifice, for which there ought to be stronger counterbalancing advantages than have yet appeared.

But it sometimes looks now as if our suddenly-developed zeal for the rights of belligerents had not been altogether a matter of choice, but as if it were merely part of an irresistible movement going on all over the world, which is gradually reversing the sympathies of mankind on the whole subject of international law. We pointed out, at the time of the Brussels and other conferences, the indications of this reaction. Down to the time of the Declaration of Paris in 1856, the development of international law had been based on the fundamental agreement of civilized nations that their common interests were bound up with the maintenance of peace, that war was an evil in itself and injurious to the general welfare, and that peace being the normal condition of international relations, the business of the world, on the breaking-out of war, was to see that it should be prevented, as far as possible, from spreading and from interfering with the ordinary operations of trade and commerce. To this view of peace and war and the international interests affected by them, may be traced almost all the accessions to the law of nations in modern times, whether actually carried into practice or advanced by the most enlightened countries as necessities of the immediate future—the abolition of privateering, the doctrine of “free ships, free goods,” or, in other words, the protection of even enemies’ commerce by neutral flag; that of “effective blockade”; and, finally, our own project, advanced as an amendment to the Declaration of Paris, for the exemption of all private property on sea except in case of contraband. We include here the abolition of privateering because, though in form merely a renunciation on the part of naval powers of a certain means of attack and defence, it was an alteration in the direction of increased freedom of commerce.

The reaction which has set in in Europe since 1856, and since the development of the large European armies and navies, has grown out of a feeling the very opposite of the one that we have just spoken of. It cannot be said exactly that there has been any abandonment of the idea that peace is the normal state of mankind, and war an evil to be restricted and limited in its effects; but, with the growth of the military spirit, each particular nation has acquired a growing perception of the advantages to be obtained in its own case by a strict attention to its own interests, regarded as a possible belligerent; and it is obvious, when several nations do this at once, the result is the riveting of public attention upon belligerent at the expense of neutral rights, and at the expense of a good many other things which are apt to fall under the protection of neutrals. Hence we have had the somewhat extraordinary spectacle of a government like Russia urging, in a philanthropic and benevolent spirit of reform and progress, the adoption of rules of war which make the defence of small countries, or countries unprovided with a large regular army, practically impossible, and of the grave formulation by a Prussian diplomat of the theory of “benevolent neutrality”—a kind of neutrality which consists of coming as near being a co-belligerent as possible without actually forming an offensive and defensive alliance.

It is in England, however, that the new way of looking at international relations is most noticeable, because in her case the change is not the result of “earth-hunger” or great military development, while it is directly opposed to all her supposed commercial interests and to the traditions which dictated her policy down to the period of the Crimean war. If any one had predicted, at the time of the

Declaration of Paris, that in twenty years one of the most anxious questions of the future for English statesmen would be whether the doctrine of “free ships, free goods” ought not to be abandoned and privateering reintroduced, he would not have been believed. Yet such is the case. The argument in favor of a withdrawal from the Declaration of Paris already, as we ventured last year to predict it would, looks, from the only point of view from which it is now considered, unanswerable. As to privateering, there is, of course, for a great naval power like England, the same reason for resorting to it as a means of attack or defence that there is for her resorting to volunteer levies in case of an invasion. To be restricted to the use of a regular navy is to be deprived of half of her natural strength. To be compelled to adhere at the same time to the doctrine that neutral ships cover enemies’ goods, is to look forward to a state of affairs in which England will lose her entire carrying trade, and at the same time be cut off from all use of her idle ships for military purposes. A great naval power going into a war on these terms is under a state of paralysis. We may fairly look forward, therefore, to the withdrawal of England from the Declaration of Paris (which, it must be remembered, is not a real treaty, and was never actually ratified as such), and the practical abrogation of the doctrines it embodies.

Instead of finding ourselves, as seemed likely twenty years ago, on the eve of a general exemption of all private property from capture or detention in time of war, we find that in land operations the practice of requisitions, perfected in the Franco-German war by Germany, has become the most effective and economical weapon of an invading army, while at sea the partial exemptions effected by the Declaration of Paris are already rudely attacked in public discussion. From the course of this discussion in England it seems as clear as anything in the future can be, that, in case of a general European war, neither the abolition of privateering nor the principles of “free ships, free goods” will be respected, and that when the storm subsides the only remnant of the Declaration that will survive the wreck will be the rule as to effective blockades. As to privateering, it is to be observed that in the only case it has been tried since 1856—that is, in the Rebellion—the prohibition broke down, and it always must, because in the nature of the case it is impossible to enforce it. A privateer is either a lawful ship-of-war or else is a pirate, and must be dealt with as such; and inasmuch as the civilized world recognizes a wide distinction between piracy and the irregular fighting under a letter-of-marque, there is little chance that the gallows will ever be used to put an end to it.

Whether these steps, which at first sight appear to be directly retrograde, are really so or not it is perhaps as yet too early to discuss. If it should turn out that the attempt made a generation ago to ensure peace all over the world by diminishing the number of effective national weapons, such as privateering and the destruction of enemies’ commerce, had been a mistake, it would not be surprising. It may fairly be said that anything which makes wars shorter is in the interest of humanity, not merely because the world is sooner given an opportunity to return to its profitable occupations, but because the shorter wars are made, and the more certainly the fruits of victory are won, the less exposed is mankind likely to be to all the barbarism, cruelty, and crime which the inhuman passions engendered by long and doubtful wars are sure to cause. But for all this, we in the United States ought not to forget that the present reaction against neutral rights and the protection of commerce and private property from the effects of war is directly opposed, not merely to our traditional policy and interests, but, so far as it relates to neutral rights, to the whole tendency of international law down to 1856. There is this difference between a general agreement that the interests of peace coincide with those of neutrality, and a general tendency to make the most of belligerent rights—that the former is founded on a supposed common interest, while the latter is founded primarily on nothing at all but the determination at all hazards to get the better of your rivals. None of the nations which are now pushing forward belligerent rights

have any common object or interest in view, as had the half-dozen leading powers that signed the Declaration of Paris had. Russia pretends that the rule she wishes to introduce against irregular fighting is in the interest of humanity, but everybody knows that it is a mere preterce, and that what she wants is to stop the countries without regular armies from fighting at all against her. The fact is that in 1856 Europe was preparing for peace, and now each European state is preparing for war. If war comes, the United States will be the only power in charge of those interests which have been hitherto considered paramount. By a curious sort of madness, we have prepared ourselves for this trust by the invention of the not yet satisfactorily expounded "Three Rules" of the Treaty of Washington, though from the obligation under which we placed ourselves to introduce them to the rest of the world we are already practically relieved by the change of European sentiment on the whole subject of neutral and belligerent rights.

#### ENGLISH UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS OF LOCAL EXAMINATION.

**A**MID the immense development of the public-school system of the United States, which, although it now numbers its colleges and universities, was originally planned for the purposes of elementary and secondary education alone, it is not surprising that the function of private institutions for imparting secondary education has attracted comparatively little attention. In England, where the national schools are an innovation only affecting the elementary education of the poorer classes, and where schools originating in private endowments or conducted by private enterprise still hold such preponderant influence, the inquisitive spirit of this century has exerted all its ingenuity in bringing such schools to the test of scrutiny by an external authority, thus obliging them to reveal to the public their aims and methods, that what is good may acquire fresh authority and what is bad may be condemned.

In 1858, the system of "University Local Examinations" was begun. These examinations were designed for boys' schools of the middle class, where the pupils leave at sixteen or eighteen years of age to adopt practical avocations. They were not intended for the great public schools—Eton, Harrow, Rugby, etc.—and have not been used by them. For the benefit of schools of this class, a different system of university supervision has been now lately devised.

The three essential features in which local examinations differ from examinations held at only one centre are: 1. They are a vast economy of expense and trouble to examinees. Instead of the candidates from each local centre—often a hundred or more—being obliged to incur the expense and inconvenience of going up to the university for examination, a single representative officer from the university comes down to them. He brings with him the papers of questions, superintends the examination (which is almost entirely by writing), and takes the answers of the candidates back with him to the university, where they are submitted to the examiners, who report upon them through the local secretary at each local centre. The university fees charged to the candidates are small, varying from £1 to £2 for the different examinations, and the local committee—a volunteer organization which makes the local arrangements—charges a fee also, usually about ten shillings, to pay for the hire of an examination-room and other expenses. By means of these fees the examinations are entirely self-supporting. The second essential feature of local examinations is their wide range of optional subjects, which opens them, in a greater or less degree, to almost every grade of school and of individual talent; and, lastly, their wide extension has produced a fruitful comparison of local standards and methods of education.

The standard in each subject of the Senior Local Examinations (for persons under eighteen) is about that of an average college entrance examination. Like such matriculation examinations, the Senior Local Examination is intended as a survey and test of previous progress, and marks the close of school life. The Junior Local Examination is somewhat easier, and is intended to test progress below the age of sixteen.

In 1865, the Cambridge Local Examinations were extended to women, and, a few years after, Oxford followed the example of Cambridge. In 1865, the University of Edinburgh instituted a system of examinations for both boys and girls. The University of Durham has also extended its local examinations to girls. It has, perhaps, been in their effect upon female education that the local examinations have most conspicuously shown their merits. Previous to their extension to girls, the work done in

English private girls' schools, judging from the reports of the Schools Enquiry Commissioners, made about this time, was as superficial and ill-regulated as it is at present in most girls' schools in this country, except that, even then, English girls were probably better acquainted with religious history, geography, and English grammar than our girls, and possessed a familiarity with the history and literature of their own country which most of our young women might well envy. There, as here, natural science was a mere sham, represented usually in the school curriculum by "lectures" which involved neither real teaching nor learning. We do not know whether there prevailed in England to the same extent as there does here the curious notion that to girls competition is a moral bane, and that the marked distinction of good scholars from bad is to be carefully avoided as if the whole of social life were not a continual comparison of individual powers and gifts, which men and women alike must learn, early in youth or never, to bear with generous acquiescence in the triumphs of others and with moral equilibrium amid their own advantages. The state of mathematical study among girls in England before 1865 may be judged of from the fact that at the trial examination, held by a committee of ladies in London in 1873, when Cambridge was contemplating the extension of the local examinations to women, out of the forty senior candidates thirty-four failed in arithmetic. How entirely this deficiency was due to faulty education was shown at the first local examination to which girls were formally admitted in 1865, when out of a total of 126 candidates, junior and senior, only three failed in arithmetic. Since then, year by year, the average quality of the work done at these examinations by the girls has risen, and the number of candidates has constantly increased. In December, 1875, the Cambridge Local Examinations were held at fifty-six centres for girls alone, and there were 1,552 female candidates. For the Oxford Local, which began on the 29th of last May, 583 girl candidates entered. All classes of schools, except a few ultra-conservative ones, now prepare their pupils for these examinations, and girls of every grade of social position, from the lower middle-class up to the highest aristocratic summits, enter yearly as candidates. The whole tone of school work has been invigorated, as well as the tone of home instruction by resident governesses, while a corresponding elevation has taken place in the character of women of the latter class. The better ones now receive the same salary as a male tutor, are treated on terms of equality by the family, and are in many cases entirely relieved of the care of their pupils out of school-hours. Among visiting governesses the demand for thorough instruction in "English" subjects has opened a field even to women professing no "accomplishments." Parents no longer expect to find in one person proficiency in all the arts and sciences. One lady recently told the writer that when she began her career as a teacher some twenty years ago, her most sanguine dream of gain never exceeded £50 a year. Now, by lectures in schools and private tuition in the English branches, especially physiology and geography, her annual income is £800.

The improvement in the private schools effected by the local examinations has prepared the public for a high standard in the great endowed schools for girls now being instituted in England, and they have made the existence of a college like Girton possible. The sad want of correlation between schools and the so-called colleges for women in this country is seen in the huge preparatory departments by which Vassar and Wellesley are hampered. In 1875, out of 384 students at Vassar, 159 were preparatory students. At Wellesley, out of 300 students who entered last autumn, some 250 were relegated to the preparatory classes by the test of the entrance examination. At Smith College, out of some 200 candidates for matriculation, fourteen were found fit to form a freshman class. If one asks at Vassar and Wellesley why the fatal incultus of preparatory students is endured at these institutions, the answer is that there are no schools to prepare them. It seems a pity that the strictly collegiate character should not be always maintained at the cost of a temporary loss of pupils, while, by throwing the onus of preparation upon the schools, their character might be improved.

The only movements in this country at all resembling the formation of a system of local examinations have been made by Harvard and Yale. One of these is the holding of matriculation examinations at Cincinnati and Chicago as well as Cambridge and New Haven, and the encouragement by the former of candidates to enter the examination who do not intend to become students of the university. In as far as this examination is held at more than one centre, we have here the germ of a system of local examinations, except in one of the essential features—i.e., all the subjects of examination (except the new requisitions in natural science) are required, including the classical subjects. This at once shuts out all but the classical schools of high character and the more ambitious pupils in such schools. To this



matriculation examination only male candidates are admitted. The Harvard examinations for women, on the other hand, which will hereafter be held at two centres, Cambridge and the city of New York, offer the proper characteristic of local examinations, as to the option allowed in the number and kind of subjects chosen. They are, unfortunately, for women only; possibly, however, this feature may be altered in the future, and, as the case stands, the character of Harvard, the examining authority, forbids the supposition of a low or feminine standard in marking. In this respect of being for women alone, the Harvard examinations are similar to what the Cambridge Higher Local Examinations (for persons over eighteen years of age) were in England up to 1873. In that year they were thrown open to men, in deference to the opinion of the influential party who object to special educational systems for women. Up to the present year, however, no men have presented themselves, yet the standard has been maintained and excellent work has been done. In general, the ability of women to maintain an independent standard is still so doubtful that the principle of common methods and common tests of education for the two sexes is certainly preferable. It should not, however, prevent women from availing themselves of such an opportunity as that offered by Harvard, while the examining body should feel the necessity of awarding its degrees or certificates *as to male candidates*, lest such certificates be meaningless. If women are passed on a lower number of marks than men, each certificate is expressed in terms of an unknown standard, for which every man will substitute his estimate of female ability. For, owing to insufficient opportunities of evidence, a female standard of excellence does not exist. As yet the male standard is our nearest approach to an absolute measure of human power. Under a system of indulgent criticism, the examiners, indeed, may make valuable observations on the candidates, but to the public the immediate gain of information on the vexed question of woman's powers is nothing, nor can the salutary stimulus of "plucking" produce its effects.

One is much struck by the little interest shown in Harvard examinations for women compared with the quick response in England when university examinations were offered to girls. When Cambridge allowed girls to participate in its local examinations of 1863 on trial, at a fortnight's notice, and with only six weeks allowed for preparation, eighty-three girls were presented for examination. When the Cambridge Higher Local Examinations, for persons over eighteen years of age, were instituted, ninety-one candidates attended the first examination. In 1875, there were, at ten centres, two hundred and twenty-nine candidates in attendance. In 1874, there were seven candidates for the Harvard preliminary examination for women; in 1875, five for the preliminary and three for the advanced; this year, five for the preliminary and only one for the advanced. This smallness of numbers as compared with the English figures cannot be accounted for by the opportunities which our public schools offer. A large proportion of the girls who come up to the local examinations in England correspond, socially, to the wealthy, leisure class here, which does not send its children to the public schools to any considerable extent. Of course, the successful application of the examination system to girls in England is largely due to the fact that local examinations had been in operation for the benefit of boys five years before it was thought of extending them to girls. There had been much able writing on the subject, and all its aspects were thoroughly appreciated.

The question is often asked how preparation for any special examination can be introduced into a school without its either directing too much the general school-work, or else isolating from their comrades those pupils who wish to become candidates. Practically, schoolmistresses in England have been glad of the guidance afforded by the local examinations as to a programme of work. In schools which undertake to prepare their pupils as candidates, a whole class works up towards the examinations, and then those girls who wish to enter, and who are fully prepared, are sent in. All the class meanwhile has shared in the benefit of association with those members who are working towards a special end, and in that of being constantly tested in writing papers at sight. The class is liable at any moment to be called into a separate room, where a paper is put before them covering any portion of the ground they have gone over. It is of the same length and grade as the regular examination papers, and the class are required to write their answers in the time allotted by the university to one paper. Thus, when these girls go in to the university examination there is none of the excitement and worry that parents and schoolmistresses, to whom the system is a novelty, dread so much for their young charges.

As to the danger of mere cramming, so often urged, it is a sufficient answer that if individual candidates are willing to stake their reputation on that method of preparation, school-teachers in general are not willing to

risk theirs through their pupils in any such manner. Again, pure cram requires an amount of memory which is itself a rare talent.

For those girls' schools in England whose method has been perfected by means of the Local Examinations, the London University Examinations for men, and the Girton Entrance Examination, and which are worthy to frame their own curriculum, a new opportunity is now offered in the extension to girls' schools of the services of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board, which has just taken place. This Board was formed in 1873 with special reference to the great public schools, such as Eton, Rugby, Harrow, Winchester. These schools, enjoying an exalted independent status, having the best specimens of university men as masters, and being partially tested by the subsequent career of their scholars at the universities, had never availed themselves of the local examinations. Lately, it has been thought desirable that these great bodies should be subjected to more direct scrutiny and brought still more closely into relation with the universities. The school applies to the university to have examiners sent down to it, and these examiners examine either in the general work of the school or in any main subject of instruction, or they examine the highest division of the school. This scheme is, of course, a far more expensive one than that of local examinations. It is not likely that in this country, for a long time to come, examiners will have leisure to run down to private schools for a stay of several days, nor that the schools will be prepared to defray any such expense. Some of the girls' schools in England are quite ready for this new opportunity, such as the Ladies' College, Cheltenham, Miss Bass's Collegiate School in the north of London, and others. The extension to girls' schools of this scheme was made by the universities under scarcely any pressure from without.

Looking at these great systems, and at the fine training which English women of the upper classes receive, one cannot but long that our American girls of the leisure class should awaken to their own intellectual needs. Nobody would venture to maintain that our fashionable girls' schools (with one or two honorable exceptions) give a solid education; and yet, year after year, many hundreds of dollars are spent on the education of each pupil, and she passes long hours of every day in the confinement of the school-room, only to leave it at eighteen, if naturally clever, with a despairing disgust for the culture she has vainly groped after, or, if a dunce, with confirmed self-complacency in her ignorance. The effect of such education is not only intellectual, it is a moral, blight, for its atmosphere is that of sham.

The ephemeral nature of wealth and position in a community like ours renders their effect on personal character enervating rather than stimulating, and this effect is most conspicuous in our women, to whom are left mostly the conduct of "society," in the narrow sense of the word, and the provision of the æsthetic element in domestic life. Thus their culture is in the arts of luxury; it is often very emotional, or, perhaps, one may better call it romantic; Swinburnian poetry and French fiction are conspicuous elements in it; it is intensely subjective and introspective. All this lends a powerful and subtle charm to our American women, but it leaves real education to be monopolized by those who seek it as a means of livelihood.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.—XI.

##### AMERICAN ART.—II.

PHILADELPHIA, July 29, 1876.

THE want of accent and anxious gentility of most of the modern American pictures causes us to linger with considerable tenderness among their predecessors, the Colonial or early Revolutionary canvases. Here at least is the distinction of a past school of thought. Benjamin West, besides his rather melancholy masterpieces in the English Department, is represented, more relishingly, by a portrait of his American period, before the age of twenty-five; it is that of Stephen Carmick, "a signer of the Non-Importation Act," smug, hard as an icicle, sitting across a chair as if on horseback, the beady eyes turned self-consciously contrariwise to the direction of the head, and an air of false amiability worthy of Lawrence Sterne. The manipulation, timid and cold, is confined to registering the social proprieties of 1765. C. W. Peale is seen in two of his better works, where the unctious of the subject has enticed him away from his usual dried formality; his General Cropper, a bluff yeoman warrior, and the sweet, young, rustic-looking Mrs. Cropper, give one a more human idea of the man of many ingenuities than would be looked for. His son Rembrandt's likeness of Washington, and Wertmüller's Washington, are here, too, for comparison with the superb monumental portrait by Stuart. Vanderlyn's "General John Armstrong," dark and faded as if seen through a veil, gives us the participant of the losses at Brandywine and Germantown in

his blacker mood; the same artist's "Ariadne" recalls in brighter guise the fame of the artist who was medalled by Napoleon. Dunlap's portrait of Thomas Eddy, black, strong, Brougham-like, and full of character, represented as studying the report on Hudson River exploration and canal navigation, is the work of a feeble portraitist battling with an opportunity beyond his strength. Morse's "Lafayette," with his eyebrows of perpetual amazement, who starts back in dismay from the busts of Washington and Franklin, is another of the curiosities of Room 44 in the Annex. A simpler portrait by Morse, the old woman in a mob-cap, who straightens herself up as if to deliver a repartee, is more intelligible in expression, but errs with the same Opie-like smeared touches. Stuart's smaller portraits—as the old, shrewd-looking gentleman who reads the "*Pennsylvania Gazette*, No. 179," and the ornamental and well-preserved "Mrs. Nathaniel Coffin"—are almost always masterpieces; besides the character, the tender modelling, with little dwellings of the brush and lateral sweeps of color, is a lesson for painters; nine or ten specimens of this sensitive hand may be reckoned up, and they form a festival for the student. Stuart Newton, the nephew, represents, with W. S. Mount, the anecdote-painting of the next generation—the former by his "King's Poem," with the young literary king fastidiously showing his verses to a fat sycophant, and the latter by his "Corn-husking." Newton is shown, too, by his successful and precious cabinet portrait of Washington Irving. From these dead anecdotists and jesters we come down with a little fatigue to those who support the same roles at present.

Mr. Eastman Johnson's jocular "Old Stage-Coach" forms a central object immediately opposite the entrance to the principal American room, where the unlucky silhouette of its dismantled carriage-body, cut black against the distance like an exaggerated Chinese puzzle, forms a greeting the reverse of conciliatory; the obstinate difficulty which this artist finds in inventing a pleasing composition is almost unprecedented. The "Corn-husking Scene" (recently criticised in these columns) is more felicitously composed, with a vista and point of sight and a harmony of arrangement; but the "Kentucky Home," with negroes irregularly studded upon a dark, close relief, is positively repellent, doing injustice to its own qualities of patience and pathos; "Milton and his Daughters" is a faded conventionalism, altogether too high-heeled and courtly to touch the heart; in a single figure the artist succeeds better. The lady "Catching a Bee" in a garden flower is the best work we remember of the author, and, though hung nearly out of sight, attracts and compels notice by its play of soft glittering sunshine and delicate type of feminine beauty. Mr. Johnson, however, is not the one to stand within a doorway to challenge visitors as the champion of American *genre*. The trouble with him is, not that he imitates any foreign school, not that he offends by any kind of pretence, but only that he is washy and that it is easy to forget him.

Of Mr. La Farge, there is to be said that it is a crying injustice and an undeserved cruelty for him to occupy his faculties with so many flower-studies, but that the extraction of the great "Saint Paul" from his studio for the adornment of the Exhibition was a magnanimous act, to be warmly appreciated. Mr. La Farge's flowers are better than other people's flowers—their groupings of color are, more than any one else's, like the groupings of a pack of gorgeous odalisques by Diaz, and they make the most harmonious ornaments imaginable; but a flower-study is for such an artist little more than a piece of graceful ballet posturing, and does not reward a very long attention, even when it appeals to human sympathy in the form of a votive wreath with a Greek inscription. The "Saint Paul" which Mr. La Farge exhibits is a large figure, intended in all honesty for a church, and, as well as the "Virgin" and "Saint John" which remain behind in the studio, to be considered as a legitimate specimen of monumental painting, mural decoration, and religious appeal, suitable less for gallery use than for ecclesiastical pomp. It is decidedly noble in conception; the moral purity, intellectual simplicity, transparent self-abnegation, are very perfect. We are not sure that so religious a picture has been yet produced by any countryman of ours. The color is of a certain deep sweet dignity and repose that goes well with the theme; as a matter of composition, it appears to us that the sudden brightening of the curtain behind the figure at a definite spot around the extended hand, done so as to relieve it unnaturally with white, and force an unwilling attention to the gesture, is an expedient rather of theatrical than of religious art; and the hesitating halo which throbs around the head is more dingy than subdued. A halo, one would say, should either be frankly and blankly displayed, as a symbol, or entirely omitted if realism is the effect sought; none of the half-way trials at making traditional treatment look like natural accident deceive anybody—least of all, Mr. Hermann Hunt's ingenious ad-

justment of the head of a naturalistic Christ in the circle of a naturalistic window. Mr. La Farge's "Saint Peter," as he stands in his utter provincial rudeness, his outlines floating, confused, and blotted against the simple drapery of an Eastern tent, planted well on both feet, dealing out the committed message with both hands, and retaining a great deal of the child behind the wrinkles and grizzlines of old age, is a memorable figure, rich in the most touching and inmost attributes of religious art. Mr. La Farge likewise sends his life-size portrait of a boy sitting beside a large hound; it is a study of character and color, the tone of the flesh being conspicuously well carried off by a system of harmonious surroundings.

Paintings so individual as these are what we have best to show, among a crowd of works usually betraying with the utmost pride of subservience the influence of a particular foreign master or school. After contemplating the Bierstadts, which positively boast of their resemblance to Lessing and Achenbach, and the Thomas Hills, which are pale reminiscences of pale Kuwasseg, and the Thomas Morans, which are violent lunges at Calame and Turner alternately, it is like coming to a reality again to find the landscapes of Mr. H. Herzog, now naturalized in this country, and painting American scenery in such a Teutonic tone that we expect to hear the traditional jödel and detect the traditional chamois among the hills. Mr. Herzog gives us a Yo-Semite scene, between Sentinel Rock and Union Point; it is painted with a brush of such experienced ease and certainty of effect that most of the American landscape looks experimental or straining beside it. As we watch Herzog's evening shadow creeping up the terrible precipice, we seem to see it move voluntarily like a climber, attaining every moment more giddy ledges and more treacherous fissures, among whose increasing difficulties the eye is pained to be led. The illusion is there because the artist had a definite theme, that of the afternoon shadow, and to this purpose broadened out his execution. We experience a sensation rather uncomfortable than otherwise before the large neighbors which the American gallery accumulates in each other's presence—the "Donner Lake" of Mr. Thomas Hill, the "Holy Cross Mountain" of Mr. Thomas Moran, and the "Settlement of California" of Mr. Bierstadt; as among the family of giants in a museum, we cannot but feel that an admiration is expected of us which can only be felt by falsifying our point of view, and that for objects to have panoramic proportions is of less consequence than for them to be pleasing.

Mr. Bridgman and Mr. Moore are fair examples of just what our young men are gaining by going abroad to study. Each such acolyte seems to show himself thereafter with the mark of "Par's" or "Munich" sealed upon his forehead. Mr. Bridgman sends a "Story-teller," a Nubian improvisatrice retelling the Arabian Nights to a half-score of beauties of the harem. The monstrous ear-rings of the speaker, who squats upon the ground like a hideous black idol in a harness of spangles and ornaments—these alarming ear-rings are the keynote of the whole picture; they are a little too pronounced; in this kind of delineation it is understood that the slaves must all be beautiful, the feet all arched, the eyes well fenced with paint, the nudity seductive, and in a general way the jewelry strictly set in front and the ethnology kept subordinate. Yet Mr. Bridgman is an honest, industrious, and skilful painter; his "Flower of the Amen" a girl toying with a peacock-fan, and his resolute-looking "Krybyle Woman," with her Jael-like head and fantastic ornaments, are excellent specimens of life-size portraiture; his scene where a Breton farm-lad drives a team of oxen is, on a smaller and more manageable scale, a good effect of landscape and *genre*, and one of his pleasantest works; but every picture mentioned is most obviously a work of tutelage, the composition and way of looking at life are European and conventional, and there is little to show that the clever student is engaged in plunging into his own American consciousness and simply stating his surprises and summaries. Something like this has been the difficulty with our literature; and although it would be absurd to expect a civilization to med of ready-made old-world habits to develop a new language in the arts, yet just as every artist or thinker of merit is original to some extent among his peers, so we rightly wish for American originality to have an accent apart from European originality. Mr. Humphrey Moore has always seemed to enjoy a rather deeper perception than his fellow-student: there was an audacity about his early experiments—Spaniards howling a ballad, or gipsies shearing a donkey, in rude, realistic presentment—that promised a way of his own in getting at the life of a country. His "Almeh," at the Exhibition, is rather cruelly used by the glaring skylight; but although missing the tone which it would acquire in an ordinary room, and looking somewhat rude, it is a surprisingly forcible work for a young artist. It represents one of the Moorish lords of Spain entertained by the dancing of his dark-eyed favorite. The point of sight is chosen rather low, so that the reclin-



ing nobleman, as if seen from the floor, has his knee in his mouth, and his feet are exaggerated by the foreshortening of the limbs and torso; this gives the more prominence to the "Almeh," seen in a simple standing attitude without perspective. The two heads are well painted, and the Alhambra lends a background of pale iridescent tints, and a tempered illumination which equally diffuses the light, so that there are no shadows, and the well-modelled flesh of the girl wears a sort of robe of gray air, as if seen inside an alabaster cylinder. This picture, for technical qualities, is certainly one of the most satisfactory in the American department, yet it is a satisfactoriness of promise rather than of fulfilment. It is almost mathematically easy to argue from the "Almeh" a future style of painting in which Mr. Moore will evolve certainty out of the pleasantly-glimmering effects which are tentative here; and with a rather simpler composition, broader chiaroscuro, and narrower insight, begin to utilize in historical or religious art his liking for Orientalisms. He sends, on a smaller scale, a merchant selling a sword to a pair of Bedouin cavaliers in some street of Cairo, in which the richly draped figures relieve against the whitened walls in the braggart style of Regnault—or rather of Clairin. There is evident muscle in Mr. Moore, and, as soon as he finds something to express, he will certainly deliver himself from the mere gymnasium in which he is exercising now, and begin to work.

Mr. Toby Rosenthal exhibits his "Elaine," a picture which has attracted a great deal of attention in California, and with some reason, for as an illustration of Tennyson it is truly extraordinary. Nothing gives a greater jolt to the mind than to be brought up with a good loud translation of our household Tennyson into the dialect of Munich, as in this, or the dialect of Strassburg, as in Doré's illustrations. Here is a robust, ponderous, German princess riding on the barge, steered by a servitor of the picturesque landknecht order, and both of them taken straight out of German opera scenery. The robust corpse ought to swamp the boat instead of riding so high out of water; and Lancelot would have had little remorse at abandoning a maiden so evidently able to take care of herself. But it is usually an objectionable thing in the critic to estimate a painting from its title. If the picture represents a situation capable of standing alone and being liked for its pictorial qualities, we need not mind whether it fits a given literary frame or not. And it must be confessed that Mr. Rosenthal's Teutonic nymph lies with monumental breadth upon her catafalque, and that the composition, half sculptural and half scenic, makes an imposing and impressive picture.

German or French influence is what usually makes the rightness of our young painters' originality. Miss Anna M. Lea, and one or two landscapists who have been looking at Turner, are almost the only pupils of the English school who could be pointed out. Miss Lea paints in a rich, dusky, veiled, pastel style a series of splendid ladies who seem to have often saluted the ladies of Romney and Gainsborough. Her method, however, is conspicuously her own, and only a certain indecision of eye and a selection of laces and bric-à-brac from Wardour Street reveal London training. The stately lymphatic woman in Memorial Hall, who looks like a Birmingham Diana in moonlight, is inferior in treatment to all and any of those hung in the Annex. The "Saint Genevieve" and "Patrician Mother" are both rich and aristocratic models, painted with restrained force, colored with tender splendor, and in type reminding us of those women in society who seem born to fill panels in family portrait galleries. Besides these there is a likeness of an aged lady, more real and literal than any of the younger subjects, touched with admirable freedom and breadth, and arguing for Miss Lea a strange, haunting power over the spectator's mind; it is a portrait of which you long to know the original's history; and the painter's other subjects have something of the same strange "now I will tell you a story" suggestiveness.

E. S.

## LES DANICHEFF.

LONDON, July 15, 1876.

THE experiment of transplanting French plays from Parisian theatres to the London stage does not often answer. English translations of the best and most successful French dramas are generally bad, and English acting of French characters is almost invariably worthless. Alfred Wigan, who has now left the English stage, could personate a Frenchman without burlesque, and some of Mr. Hare's French characters are well conceived and acted, but there are the only English actors who of late years have been able to understand the character of our neighbors across the Channel. Adaptations of French plays are much affected here, but they are rarely successful. During the past season two adaptations from the French have had a fair run at one of the best London theatres, the "Court"; but the success of "Les Pattes de Mouche" and of "Une Partie à Piquet," transformed respectively into "A Scrap of Paper" and "A Quiet Rubber," is

attributable to the good acting of Mr. and Mrs. Kendal and of Mr. Hare rather than to any intrinsic merit in the adaptations. Alexandre Dumas's popular drama, "L'Étrangère," has been carefully translated into English, and produced with some flourish of trumpets at the Haymarket Theatre in the height of the season. But it had hardly a night's life in it. The first audience condemned it on the opening night, and it has no resurrection. The leading actress wrote to the *Times* to explain that she had spent nights in Paris studying the action and the attitudes of Mlle. Croisette at the Français, but even this slavish imitation did not meet with its reward. The whole thing failed. From time to time, the wholesale importation of a Parisian company to London has been tried, but it has not often proved a satisfactory speculation. In the year 1871, during the Franco-German war, the company of the Français spent the weary months during which the siege of Paris was proceeding with us in London, and they had no reason to repent their lot. The house in which they played was crowded night after night with the best sort of audiences in the world—the intellectual élite of London society; and the refined acting and delicate portraiture of Parisian life which MM. Got, Delaunay, and the other distinguished members of the *corps dramatique* presented, were applauded and appreciated by the most critical members of a critical society. London felt that the ill wind which swept over France brought at least this good to it—that an opportunity was presented of seeing what real acting was. Since then till the other day there has been no good French acting in London. The rules of the Français forbid the members of their Société to perform elsewhere than at home. Companies of French actors and actresses have been among us, but we have not cared much about them, and they have returned to the Théâtre du Palais-Royal, or to Les Variétés, or wherever they have come from, disgusted with the want of taste exhibited by the non-appreciative Briton. But the explanation of this want of appreciation is a simple one. The bulk of playgoing people in London do not belong to the more highly educated classes. Shopkeepers, stock-brokers, clerks in offices, and idlers from the country form the majority of those who frequent the London theatres. These people do not understand French, and prefer the coarse burlesque of English manufacture and English performance. The more cultivated classes in London have so much to do during the season that they have neither time nor inclination to spend their evenings at a theatre. The dinner-hour alone—eight o'clock being the hour when most people dine—precludes the frequent indulgence in this form of amusement. If they go to the play they must change, for the day, their ordinary mode of life. This is not the case in Paris. The theatre is part of the business of society, and life is accommodated accordingly. In London, the classes who constitute society will not change their ways of daily life except for something which will repay them. If a very good play is brought out, be it in English or in French or in Italian, they will stretch a point and go to see it, but they will not do so for anything that is not first-rate. They went in crowds to see the company of the Français in 1871; they went in crowds to see Signor Salvini in *Othello* and *Hamlet*; they went in crowds to see your Mr. Jefferson in *Up Van Winkle*, infamously supported as he was; and now they are going in crowds to see the company of the Odéon, reinforced by the accomplished acting of Mme. Fargueil, performing *Les Danicheff*. I went the other night to see this piece, having secured places with some difficulty several nights before the performance, and I was amazed to see so large and so brilliant an audience in any theatre on a hot night in the middle of July, when numbers of families had already quitted London for the country and the seaside. The house was full, and all around you saw well-known faces, leaders of society and leaders of literary and political coteries, vying with each other in the interest they showed in the performance.

I do not think that this play has yet been performed in America, but as it doubtless will be before long, I think the following sketch of the piece may not be without interest.

The authorship of the play is not yet accurately ascertained. It has been attributed to a gentleman who has assumed the name of "Pierre Newski." This mongrel appellation has suggested a double authorship like that of Ereckmann-Chatrian. It is supposed that the story and surroundings have been supplied by a Russian and the writing and dialogue by a Frenchman; indeed, the writing is so perfect and the dialogue so neat and epigrammatic that it has been supposed that they are the workmanship of M. Alexandre Dumas. But whether the play is the joint effort of a Russian novice and a French veteran or the production of an individual, is of small consequence. It might be interesting, if the first suggestion was the true one, as being typical of a possible alliance in the future on a political rather than a literary scale—a possibility which is neatly alluded to at the commencement of the second act, where the young French attaché of the piece, after recounting

the incidents of an encounter with a grizzly bear from whose embraces he was rescued by the Russian hero, is answered by his preserver with the remark—more keenly appreciated in Paris, perhaps, than in London—“When a Frenchman is taken unawares by a wild beast, what is more natural than that a Russian should go to his assistance?” There is, however, enough interest of a practical kind in the play itself to make it well worth seeing, without the necessity of speculating on its origin or its allusions.

The first scene opens in the country seat of the Dowager Countess Danicheff during the reign of the Emperor Nicholas, and therefore before the emancipation of the serfs. The Countess is seated in her own room, with her parrot and her basket of kittens, listening, in company with two elderly maiden ladies, her dependants and toadies, to Anna, a beautiful protégée of the Countess's, who is reading for the entertainment of these three wicked old ladies passages from the life of the Chevalier Faublas—“ce cher Faublas,” as the Countess calls him—which, for the sake of human and especially of maiden nature, it is to be hoped that Anna does not understand. Anna is of servile origin, and, though educated and brought up by the Countess as her daughter, is legally a serf. To them enter Vladimir, the only son of the Countess, who has just received orders to join his regiment at Moscow, whither he has to start without delay. The drama is now about to commence. The Countess, proud of her son's prospective military distinction, is profuse in her professions of attachment, and Vladimir, taking advantage of this unaccustomed effusion on the part of his cold-hearted mother, has a solemn interview with her, in the course of which he informs her of his unalterable love for Anna and the reciprocity of hers for him. For a moment the Countess is beside herself with indignation, but she controls herself sufficiently to dissemble an acquiescence in her son's views. She exacts one condition—namely, that the matter should stand over for a year, and that Vladimir should be a constant visitor at the house of the Prince Valanoff in Moscow, whose attractive daughter, Lydia, will soon, in the Countess's opinion, put a stop to this romantic attachment. Vladimir agrees, and after a touching leave-taking, in which a black retriever dog plays a not unimportant part, he goes away. The Countess then appears in her true character—haughty, cruel, and imperious—the *grande dame* of the reign of Nicholas. She is arranging her “autumn marriages” among her serfs, and Anna is ordered to prepare at once to marry the coachman, Ossip, who is to be liberated from serfdom as well as to be married. At this point the drama becomes almost too painful to witness. The exhibition of feeling which Anna is called upon to display, while she throws herself now at the feet of the Countess, now at the feet of Ossip, and again at those of the priest, is realistic almost to excess, though as given by Mlle. Hélène Petit it is simple and natural and almost unexaggerated. But there is no escape for the unhappy girl. The Countess is resolute and deaf to her entreaties, and Ossip admits that he has loved her for years. In an almost unconscious state she signs the register, clinging against hope to a promise given her by Ossip that for a year he will regard her as a sister.

The second act opens in the drawing-room of the Princess Lydia at Moscow. It is filled with a brilliant company of the élite of Russian society, and it is made cool and pleasant to look at in this hot July weather by the device of a fall of snow which appears to be going on outside. The conversation is animated and amusing, and the epigrams and good things of a young French attaché, Roger de Taldé by name, are good enough to make the fortune of a dozen English plays. Vladimir is a constant visitor, but the only effect of his visits is, not that he has fallen in love with Lydia, but that Lydia has fallen in love with him, while he remains constant to Anna. The Countess joins the party and settles down to a hand at piquet with Lydia's father, while the young attaché proposes to Lydia. She rejects him, and he, like a true Frenchman, determines on revenge, and commences weaving designs to counteract those of Lydia on Vladimir. He tells the latter of Anna's marriage, and the news works as he desires. Vladimir demands an interview with his mother, and a stormy interview they have, ending with a declaration by Vladimir that he will at once leave Moscow, find Anna and Ossip, put them both to death, and then kill himself. The third act passes in Ossip's cottage, where Anna and Ossip are living as brother and sister, Ossip being, as he says himself, “resolute,” and Anna “confiding.” A dramatic interest hangs around them at this moment, as the audience are aware of Vladimir's resolve and are awaiting his appearance with some excitement. The Countess, however, intervenes, and makes proposals to Ossip regarding Anna, which, being now free, he treats with indignant contempt, and Vladimir enters bent on his murderous designs. Ossip explains the relations which exist between him and Anna, and offers to give her up, though he loves her dearly, as soon as a divorce can be ob-

tained, and the curtain falls upon a reconciliation and not upon a triple tragedy.

The fourth act brings us back to the country seat of the Countess. Anna and Vladimir are on the same footing while the negotiations for the divorce are pending as they were in the first act, except that Roger de Taldé finds some difficulty in knowing exactly how to address the half-wedded bride of one man who is the *fiancée* of another. The divorce negotiations have been, by some fatality, entrusted to the Princess Lydia, who arrives from Moscow with the sad news that the negotiations have failed, the Emperor refusing to listen to the proposal that one of Russia's nobility should marry a serf. Roger sees through this refusal. It is not the Emperor but the Princess who has raised the bugbear, and his ingenuity is not at fault. If Ossip will renounce the world as well as Anna, and become a priest, he will use one of Lydia's tools, a “brandy farmer” called Zakaroff, who, through an enforced gift of many thousand rubles to the Church, has great influence, to procure a dispensation to release Ossip from the marriage. The self-denying coachman consents, out of love for Anna and for Vladimir, to sacrifice himself. The dispensation is procured; he signs the book, and is divorced from Anna and wedded to the Church. Vladimir and Anna are made happy; the designs of the wicked Countess and the intriguing Princess are brought to naught. Roger de Taldé has punished the Princess and repaid the preserver of his life, and he ends a remarkably clever piece with the not inappropriate words, “And when I tell this story in Paris, nobody will believe me.”

## Correspondence.

### NEED WE MAKE THE “OLD MAN” MADDER?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I infer from your last number that you find fault with Hayes and his adherents because they do not come out against Grant and Grantism. Is it not fair to consider that, should he do so, he would probably make a triangular fight of the campaign, with two sides against him, and so be pretty sure of a defeat? Please observe that Grant is still very strong with the official people (all influential), and also very strong with masses of the old-fashioned, honest, simple Republicans of the rural districts, including multitudes of soldiers. Millions of Northern people will not be convinced by a few or many bad selections for office that our Wellington, our Iron Duke, is altogether unworthy of respect, and should be attacked by his own party. I know honest and excellent men, old abolitionists and good patriots, who become very angry if one criticises Grant without mercy. Then there are the Conklingites, without whom we cannot carry New York, I suppose, and who are already sufficiently disgusted by the setting aside of their own champion and by Hayes's views on civil-service reform. To attack Grant and Grantism openly is to attack Conkling and the Conklingites, and to change them from cool friends into warm enemies. The result of such a policy would be Tilden and Hendricks instead of Hayes and Wheeler. Can you expect the Republican candidate to aim at such a result? Would it be best to have him do so? Ought we to advise him to (substantially) withdraw his name in favor of Tilden?

You doubtless fear for the chances of civil-service reform if Hayes comes into office with the aid of Conkling, Chandler, and that sort of tricksters. So do I. But if Tilden comes in, backed by the old spoils party and by a hungry “united South,” civil-service reform will be dead for many a day. There will be an immediate “rotation in office” such as never was seen before. Eighty thousand men will go out and eighty thousand men will come in. Once more the public conscience on this subject will be stunned and slaughtered. Observe that the Democratic party has never done anything on this subject except in the spirit of Old Hickory. The Republican party has at least been willing to pretend to do something, and thus far to acknowledge the weight of independent opinion. My private belief is that Hayes on this point is sound and earnest, and that he will prove courageous and persevering.

But I have wandered from my text. My object was simply to argue that it would be impolitic and fruitful of injury to push Hayes and his adherents into a distinct attack upon Grant and Grantism by name. The President already believes that our candidate has assaulted him in simply refusing a second term. One of his intimates lately said to a trustworthy acquaintance of mine in Washington: “The ‘Old Man’ is as mad as hell about it.” Well, the “Old Man” can do harm. He can perhaps trip us up, and perhaps means just now to do it. Why should we want to keep him mad or make him madder?



I admit, as all reform Republicans must do, that the situation is morally awful. But now that Hayes is nominated mainly in obedience to our bidding, now that he has hoisted our flag, I think we had better support him with a hearty good-will, and make as few difficulties as possible for him, hoping the best. If I were editor of a reform paper, I would say as little as possible about men, and as much as possible about principles. And, if I had to mention our candidate, I would be careful not to saddle him with the responsibilities of our present Sultan, who is only too anxious, I fear, to give him the political bowstring.

Meantime, within the limits of our respective States, let us out-manceuvre our Cornells and nominate our Everts and Curtises. These home duties are often badly attended to—I might almost say, always badly attended to. We send partisan reprobates to Congress, we fill both wings of the Capitol with thimble-rigging wire-pullers, and then we rave at the incapacity and rascality of the Administration. Poor, honest, simple, soldierly, ignorant Iron Duke, there in the White House! We voters at home surround him with able scalawags, and then rave at him for being misled. I suspect that we shall do no better by Hayes if he gets in; and that then we shall trounce him for the inevitable results of our own laziness. Remember that a free people always has just as good a government as it deserves, and no better.

Respectfully yours,

NEW HAVEN, CONN., July 24, 1876.

#### A JUST OBSERVATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am a great admirer of Carl Schurz, but I do not think he should predict that Mr. Tilden's election would rouse "false hopes among the lawless element in the South by their party victory and the increase of terrible excesses and reactionary efforts," without giving us some very strong reasons for his prophecy.

I have not forgotten that it was only two years ago that Massachusetts was implored to send back to Congress an "unbroken front," or else there would "go up all over the South a rebel yell," and fresh outrages would "begin again on a larger scale than ever." Massachusetts' front was badly (?) broken. A more peaceable reign at the South, and a change for the better in the Administration in dealing with the South, were results which immediately followed. No "yells" were reported. I had hoped Mr. Schurz would feel so encouraged about the future of the South that he would not help that class of politicians who are so anxious to divert attention from their misdeeds by cries of outrages and rebel persecutions; but it will not be surprising if Butler's and Dr. Loring's chances for Congress are improved by quotations from his recent political predictions.

It seems to me impossible to elect many men to Congress in favor of civil-service reform if we are to lay great stress upon the Southern question.

Yours respectfully,

G.

WALTHAM, July 27, 1876.

#### AMERICAN FLUNKEYISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have read with satisfaction in one of your contemporaries a protest, couched in stronger terms than I should venture to use, against the excessive homage paid to members of the English aristocracy when they visit the United States. Some time ago, Lord Dufferin was received at Chicago not merely with the respect and cordiality which are due to him, but with an amount of adulation which would scarcely have been paid to rank by its most servile worshippers in England.

We may be told these manifestations are to be ascribed merely to the hospitality in which, as all visitors to the United States will gratefully acknowledge, Americans have no superiors; but they are capable of serious misconstruction, and when reported in England and Canada they do practically a great amount of mischief. Do your people believe in the republican principle? If they do, let them be true to it. Let them be true to it in their demeanor for the sake of others, as well as in practice for their own.

AN ENGLISH LIBERAL.

#### THE MASSACHUSETTS NORMAL ART-SCHOOL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Exceptional circumstances have forced me to delay my answer to Mr. Smith's charge in the *Nation* of June 29, of falsifying in my letter of May 25. What I stated in that letter was almost entirely from my personal knowledge, and for several of the points I shall offer in proof Mr. Smith's official reports.

Mr. Smith quotes from my letter:

1. "In the reports of the Boston School and Drawing Committee are published the names of teachers who fail to comply with the rules and prepare for special examination in drawing." This he styles "*an absolute untruth*," and says "such a list of names has never been published." By turning to the report for 1875, the reader will see, commencing on page 19 (on the 18th page is the signature of Walter Smith), a list of more than a thousand teachers with a record against each name. A note at the beginning of the list explains it thus: "The sign — signifies that the teacher did not *take* the examination in the subject at the head of the column or did not *pass* it." The fact of such a record and the use made of it are well known to all concerned.

2. "A large per cent. of the first year's students at the Art-School were either teachers of drawing in Boston and vicinity or former students of drawing in the Lowell Institute." This he calls "*untrue*." I was not a member of the School during that year, but of fifteen students of whom I chanced to know something, *nine* were professional teachers of drawing and painting in the first schools of the vicinity. When I became a member of the School, I found the students who had *not* studied at the Lowell were exceptional. Since Mr. Smith's system had secured State patronage, it became necessary for teachers generally to acquire its methods.

3. "At the close of the [first] year only thirteen out of one hundred and thirty-three students could take the diploma, and yet each successive year the system is braced by increase of work." I made this point to show that the methods of the School prohibited any one from taking the diploma who was not willing to put aside every other consideration. Mr. Smith says that twenty-two obtained the diploma. In the report of the Board of Visitors, 1875, page 20, which closes a report from Mr. Smith, it will be seen that my statement is correct. The number is thirteen. In regard to the increase of work each year, Mr. Smith says: "I assert, and can demonstrate by the printed circulars, that no additional work has been required from the first year's students since the School opened." I will give a few of the many points at which the increasing pressure was applied. In my first year at the School, three hours of each session were given to lectures. In my second year, there was an increase of one hour, half of the extra hour being taken from the intermission. Up to last February the student who had passed examinations in any subject was excused from further attention to it. This had been looked forward to as a great relief. Since that time, students must keep themselves ready for further examinations in subjects already passed or lose so many marks. Every remonstrance was met by the rejoinder, "You will get more next year." This you will hardly see formulated in any circular.

4. "The School is no longer free, there being a charge of \$20 a year. A debt of \$20,000 has been incurred by the managers during the past year, which is given as a reason for the charge." The director says that "no such debt exists, and no such reason was ever given for the fee of \$10 a term for incidentals, *not* for instruction." That such a debt *did* exist in the spring, before the legislative appropriation was made, I have the word of an officer of the School. The students, having been invited to a free school founded by the State, petitioned against the tax of \$20 a year, and to allay the agitation the managers made a statement at a regular session of the School, giving the money embarrassment as a reason for the tax. What is meant by "incidentals" is not clear, as nothing is furnished to the students in return for the \$20 except room, instruction, and the use of models. It can hardly be for the purchase of models, since we learn on page 67 of the report of the Board of Education that the *State*, during the school year just closed, had paid Walter Smith \$477 65 for models.

5. "The Finance Committee of the last Legislature refused to consider a resolution appropriating \$14,000 to the School." Mr. Smith says "this is not true." This information I recalled from a conversation with a member of the Finance Committee, who advised the preparation of a circular to the members of the Legislature which would throw light on the matter when it came up for discussion. In his absence I have consulted the *Journal* of the House. On page 342, date of March 23, 1876, I find that the Committee "asked to be discharged from further consideration"—showing that they *did* consider the proposition so far as to make the above request. I am more than glad to make the correction. Mr. Smith says: "In spite of a libellous circular issued by anonymous persons, the necessary appropriations were made." He ignores the fact that these circulars were stolen after being deposited with the legislative postmaster; that the circular deals lawfully with a question of public concern, you will see from the copy enclosed; that it was not anonymous, you will see by the list of names I send of some of those interested in its preparation, which was given to the Finance Committee for use at the proper time.

6. "A special meeting of students was called by the managers of the School to express approbation of the system." This too is denied. That the circulars were abstracted in the interest of the management of the School is capable of proof, and that the meeting was called by this interest to make the testimonial to Mr. Smith was fully understood at the time.

7. To settle the question whether there is too much to do in the first year's course at the Art-School, Mr. Smith cites the case of "several Boston public-school teachers," who, every year since the School has opened, have done their regular work, "and yet have had time in their leisure to produce all the diploma-drawings, study the subjects, and pass the examinations in addition"—i.e., to complete the course. The fact is, that up to last February, during two years and a half of the School, three had done what Mr. Smith says several do every year. Two of them are well known to me, and their experience is sufficient to deter others from attempting to follow their example.

8. Mr. Smith meets what was said in my letter about the number of graduates who find no employment by saying that no student has yet graduated nor can until the completion of the fourth year of the School, and he goes on to deprecate the employment of teachers on the strength of a year or two of study. On page 55, report of 1874-5, the Board of Visitors say that seventy-one have graduated in Class A, of whom thirty are known to be employed. On page 75 Mr. Smith himself says this difficulty has disappeared, and qualified teachers from the Normal Art-School can be secured by all the school committees requiring them, without delay.

In speaking of the injury to health inflicted by the grinding of the "system," I said that the director had advised a student, who complained of nervous prostration, to take morphine. This he declares is absolutely false, and he goes on to say that he didn't so much as know what morphine is. I repeat my statement, although it cannot be braced with proof.

My criticism was neither personal nor malicious. I did not attack the School or its director under the shield of anonymity. If I did not give my name, it was because the public had no concern to know it. My personal relations with the School have always been pleasant, and I wrote merely in the interest of art and health.

MARY GUNNING ("Art Student").

WALTHAM, Mass.

## Notes.

THE Conference of Librarians which we announced in our last number is now definitely appointed to be held at Philadelphia on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October 4-6, in the rooms of the Historical Society. The committee in charge consists of Messrs. Justin Winsor, Wm. F. Poole, and Lloyd P. Smith. A programme will be ready in September, and will be mailed on application to the Secretary, Mr. Melvil Dewey, 13 Tremont Place, Boston.—*Bulletin* No. 38 of the Boston Public Library reaches "Cape Cod" in its Check-list for American Local History, and contains besides the bibliography of early explorations in America, beginning with the Cabots.—Mr. Joel Munsell, Albany, will receive subscriptions to a 'Memoir of Lieut.-Col. Tench Tilghman,' an eminent patriot of the Revolution, the aid-de-camp and secretary of General Washington, and subsequently the business partner of Robert Morris. It has been prepared by Dr. Samuel A. Harrison, of Easton, Md., and Col. Tilghman's descendants have added to it in an appendix his private journal of the treaty at German Flats, N. Y., between the Commissioners of Congress and the Six Nations; his diary of the siege of Yorktown; a number of his letters to his father from army headquarters, 1776-1781; and several of Washington's letters to him never before published. The work is in press and will appear shortly. It will contain a portrait of Colonel Tilghman.—Upon a single page at the end of the catalogue of the exhibit of the Newspaper Pavilion in the Centennial Exhibition is a "complete directory" or bibliographical list of the newspapers published in the thirteen colonies one hundred years ago. Few things so force into sight the enormous physical growth of these United States as a comparison of this page and its little list of 37 papers with the preceding 153 pages cataloguing the 8,129 newspapers published and on file now in the Pavilion. In 1776, New York had 4 newspapers, Massachusetts 7, and Pennsylvania 9; in 1876, New York has 1,088 newspapers, Massachusetts 346, and Pennsylvania 7-8, while five States unknown in 1776 surpass Massachusetts in 1876, viz., Illinois with 707 newspapers, Ohio with 568, Iowa with 401, Missouri with 378, and Indiana with 375. Thirty-six of the newspapers of the Revolutionary days were weeklies; the sole exception, the *Pennsylvanian Evening Post*, was published three times a week. There was no daily newspaper then in this country, there are now 716; but the weeklies still hold their own.

numbering 6,139, or more than eight times as many as the dailies.—Herr Arthur von Studnitz, whose address is care of Dr. Schumacher, General Consul of the German Empire, 2 Bowling Green, New York, has come to this country on behalf of the Prussian Minister of Commerce in order to study the condition of our working-classes and report thereon to his Government. He brings to the task experience derived from a similar study in the French part of Switzerland. He desires from any source documents of all kinds shedding light on the subject in gross or in detail. A circular-letter giving full particulars may be had by those interested on application as above.—The cartoon by Leonardo da Vinci, known as "St. Anne" or "The Holy Family," in the possession of the Royal Academy of Arts, is, by permission of the Academy, to be copied in permanent photography (size 24 in. by 18 in.), and will be issued at cost-price to subscribers for six shillings and sixpence. This payment will also secure a photograph of the small sketch of the subject recently acquired by the British Museum. Subscriptions may be sent to Mr. Alfred Marks, Long Ditton, Surrey.—In the *Bibliographie de la France*, No. 25, June 17, 1876, is a chronological list of the works of George Sand (with the imprints), from 'Indiana' in 1832 to 'La Tour de Percemont' in 1876. Its pretensions to completeness may be doubted, as it omits, for one, 'Les Deux Frères,' the sequel to 'Flamarande.' But, in spite of all omissions, the tale of her literary baggage is still considerable, for it contains 108 items.

—A late number of the *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* (Braunschweig) contains a paper "On some words derived from Languages of North American Indians, communicated by Dr. Th. H. Klein." In his communication Dr. Klein forgets to mention one fact about this paper—that it was read by Dr. J. H. Trumbull before the American Philological Association in 1872, and is now reprinted, word for word, from the Transactions of the Association for that year (pp. 19-32).

—A correspondent writes us from Boston: "I question if 'The Gladiators' is not a more appropriate name than 'Police Verso' for Gérôme's picture, No. 203. I have not seen the painting, but the engravings represent the thumbs turned *down*, which is *police pressé*, and means to spare the conquered. *Police verso* is to turn the thumb up towards the chest, and was the signal for slaughter. Whoever gave the name seems to have made a blunder."

—Mr. J. B. Greenough writes us: "It has been suggested that in the second part of the 'Latin Composition,' lately published by Ginn Bros., Boston, more credit was due to some authors abroad than was indicated in the preface. As I am far from desiring to gain credit for others' work, whether my own countrymen or foreigners, I perhaps shall best avoid misconstruction by disclaiming any strict originality in the work, and at the same time expressing our particular indebtedness to Gysar's and Potts's directions on the subject and Nixon's directions and practice."

—In *Lippincott's Magazine* for August habitual readers of this periodical will find most of the contributors old acquaintances, but happily such as one does not object to meeting again, and often. Lady Barker, writing from South Africa, has to tell of a social entertainment given by herself, in which a performance by Kafir "witch-finders" (a now obsolete profession) took the place of private theatricals, let us say. Mr. Wilson's second paper on the "Eastern Shore" deals agreeably with the fish, game, and oyster harvests of the Chesapeake; and his figures in regard to the oyster traffic, mounting as they do into the millions, put imagination to the test. It marks the progress of the shermen away from the condition of the prehistoric dwellers along the Atlantic coast that they accumulate no shell-heaps. "The shells are used in immense quantities for agricultural purposes, being burned into lime and spread upon the land as a fertilizer in combination with clover. They are largely used also in improving the roads and streets, making a firm and permanently dry and smooth road-bed." The decisive strategic movement for raising the siege at Chattanooga is described briefly by Mr. Kimberly, who, as usual, does not spare Gen. Rosecrans. Mr. Edward King's "Montenegro" is interesting as having been evolved not from books, but from an actual visit to the country, and on account of the illustrations which accompany it. Though he writes as a decided admirer of the people, it cannot be said that he conceals the barbaric aspects of the Montenegrin character. He denies the charge that they are superstitious, but it does not appear that he stayed long enough among them to qualify him to judge whether they are or not, while his disqualification is suggested by his remarking that "they are far too healthy and vigorous beings to become the prey of any absurdities." A paper on George Sand, the first of two, gives a half-pennyworth of personal reminiscence to a deal of information—by no means intolerable, however—mainly derived from her autobiography.



—A glowing account of Wellesley College (for women) occupies the forefront of *Harper's*. It is written in all sincerity, but in effect this institution is praised as if programme and realization were the same thing, and much as a writer in these columns lauded Smith College, which, like Wellesley, is only a year old. What we said then (No. 557) by way of criticism on unjustifiable pretensions, is applicable in a measure to Mr. Abbott's well-meant endorsement of Wellesley, which at present consists chiefly of a preparatory department, and started last October with a confessedly low standard of admission, which it means to raise from year to year. In respect of fine grounds and a fine building it seems to be equipped as few other women's colleges are. It is just a hundred years ago this month since the battle of Long Island was fought, and the tale is here told anew with the aid of a map and of numerous wood-cuts of "incidents" drawn to order, when a little more enterprise would have procured views of some of the old houses of the battle field still extant, and of other relics. The map itself might have been larger, with the streets of modern Brooklyn overlaid. In both respects, Mr. T. W. Field's monograph on the battle, published by the Long Island Historical Society, would have furnished a model. Another seasonable article is one on Saratoga Springs. The memory of Rear-Admiral Shubrick has a proper tribute paid to it in a sketch of that officer's quiet and yet busy and honorable career afloat and ashore.

—Petermann's *Mitthe lungen* for June 13 has two articles relating to the United States: one, an account of Lieut. Wheeler's second expedition to New Mexico and Colorado (1870); the other, a description, with warm praise, of Gen. Walker's 'Statistical Atlas.' The first is accompanied by a map showing the primitive settlements of the Aztecs and allied Pueblos in New Mexico. Another map is of the recently explored Franz Josef Land, lat. 81° N. In the *Geographical Magazine* for July Mr. R. H. Major is allowed space for the reproduction of his article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* rehabilitating Verrazzano against Mr. Murphy's attacks upon him. Of more general interest is Mr. E. G. Ravenstein's paper on the Census for 1871 of the British Isles, considered with reference to birthplace and migration. The immense contrast which that nation affords to ours in homogeneity, in stability, and naturally in conservatism, appears at a glance from facts like these—that the foreign element, including natives of British colonies and those born at sea, amounted to less than one per cent. of the population (0.81), and that 72.77 per cent. of the total population resided within the counties in which they were born. Nothing could well be more un-American than this stationariness, as our State censuses might show if they would take the trouble to follow up these county movements. The foreigners, on the other hand, numbered 258,677, of whom London contained but 66,101; while in 1870 New York alone contained 419,094, of whom 201,999 were born in Ireland. The distribution of the Irish in Great Britain receives particular attention from Mr. Ravenstein. In England and Wales there were, at the date of the census, 566,540 in England and Wales, 207,770 in Scotland—2.49 and 6.18 per cent. of the total population respectively. This is not very formidable, and there has been a decided falling-off since 1861. Nevertheless, the Irish have penetrated every county, and in Lanark and Renfrew form more than ten per cent. of the population. As these topics of "local element" and "Irish element" are admirably adapted for graphic representation, they are illustrated by two colored maps, on one of which is also indicated the Irish-speaking population of Ireland. This is, of course, strongest in the counties of Mayo and Galway, most remote from civilization, where more than half the inhabitants can speak Irish. But the number is rapidly diminishing through emigration and otherwise—from 23.3 per cent. in 1851 to 19.1 in 1861 and 15.11 in 1871.

—The doubts that hung over the fate of Mr. Henry M. Stanley have been happily dispelled by five letters from him which have been received by the London *Daily Telegraph*, and summarized in the *Herald* of July 26. The explorer probably reached Ujiji during the second week in June. His adventures since we last heard from him, now nearly a year ago, have consisted in mapping the western portion of the Lake Victoria Nyanza, and exploring its western tributary, the Kagera, where he again crossed the route of Speke, and in making a visit to the eastern shore of Lake Albert Nyanza, through Kabba Rega's country, in Unyoro. In this last important expedition he had efficient support from King Mtesa, whose lake capital served him as a base of operations. He traversed the high mountain called Gamaragara, and discovered among its upper residents a pale-faced African tribe. His route to Ujiji is not yet indicated further than that his last letter, dated April 24, was written from a place in Unyamwezi some fifteen days' march from Ujiji. His purpose now is to revisit the Albert Nyanza by the way of Lake Tanganyika, and to explore thoroughly the

former basin. This will settle the question of a possible connection between the two lakes, which we suppose nobody now believes in. Singularly enough, while the next news from Stanley had been looked for by way of the Albert Nyanza, he failed to remain there long enough to encounter another explorer, in the Khedive's employ, Signor Gessi, who in April circumnavigated the lake, which he accomplished in nine days. He found it to be 140 miles long by about 50 wide, to be very shallow at the south end, very abrupt on the west shore, having harbors only on the east, and very perilous for boats; no rivers of any consequence flow into it. A few miles from its northern outlet there is a branch from the main stream running northwest towards the River Yei, a tributary of the Nile. If these rivers should prove to be identical, access to the Albert Nyanza is likely to be vastly facilitated.

—A genuine *tour de force*, and a much more useful one than such feats usually are, has been performed by the Rev. J. Goble, an American missionary in Japan. This gentleman, who, as he asserts, introduced into that country the *jirikisha* (that useful little hand-cab in which a traveller on a good road can be trundled along by one coolie at the rate of eight miles an hour, and can make journeys into the interior of fifty miles a day as cheaply as and more comfortably than on horseback) has successfully turned his attention to a work even more philanthropic. He noticed that no effort had been made to provide a literature for the blind, or rather a literature that the blind could read. The great difficulty in the way was, not to make a raised type in Japanese but to make it so as to be legible by touch. In the Katakana, or current written language of Japan, there are seventy-eight characters which represent as many sounds; and many of them so closely resemble each other, and are, besides, so intricate in their composition, as to present a difficulty in the way of their application to a blind syllabary which can only be imagined by students of the language. Mr. Goble conceived the happy idea of applying the Romanized equivalents (which are seldom of more than two letters each, and never exceed three) of the sounds to the foundation of a syllabary. His success is unequivocal and complete; and he has now the satisfaction of knowing that he has placed at the disposal of the blind the very best solace for their dreary leisure. Pupils learn the new language with astonishing facility; and we hear that the Government of Japan is taking measures to have it introduced into the blind schools and asylums throughout the empire.

#### THE PURITAN REVOLUTION.\*

HISTORIANS explain every circumstance connected with Puritanism except the one fact which needs explanation. The origin and growth, the triumph, of Puritanism have been amply explained both by friends and by foes. The reaction which overthrew the Commonwealth has been often described, and the causes which produced it have been often analyzed. Nor does the Royalist reaction cause intelligent students much surprise or seem, in their eyes, to need much explanation. Every revolutionary movement has been marked by vehement alternations of popular sentiment. Louis XVI. began his reign as the most popular of monarchs. In 1789, he was still regarded as the friend of his people. In 1793, he died on the scaffold, and neither his merits nor his misfortunes have regained for his memory the esteem of France. In 1793, the French people were mad with democratic enthusiasm; in 1804, the same people adored the Emperor. In 1848, Frenchmen could not tolerate the conservatism of Louis Philippe; in 1852, they welcomed the despotism of Louis Napoleon. Such ebbs and flows of feeling are the necessary accompaniments of revolutionary crises, and (as it would be easy to show) are not, in fact, signs of popular fickleness. That the stern rule of the Commonwealth should have been succeeded by the loyalty and dissoluteness of the Restoration is not a matter difficult of explanation. The true problem presented by the history of Puritanism is to account for the fact that the Puritans, when once defeated, fell as a party for ever. During half a century the strength of Puritanism seemed to wax greater and greater. Throughout the reign of James I. the Puritan opposition increased in power. The whole of the reign of Charles was a long struggle with opponents who defeated him first in Parliament and lastly in the battle-field. The death of the king appears the close of a long struggle; the rule of Cromwell looks like the sign of the permanent triumph of the Puritans. The accession of Richard is, from the very absence of personal claims on his part, a curious sign of the strength of the Protector's government. The rule of the Puritans had, no doubt, features which excited popular dislike; but the Puritans had performed achievements which generally conciliate national gratitude.

\* The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, 1603-1660. By F. R. Gardiner. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Their arms had saved the unity of the empire; their statesmanship had anticipated the union with Scotland and Ireland which was ultimately proved to be the necessary basis of British power; their diplomacy had placed England in the front of Protestant states, and had made her name respected throughout the Continent. Their government, moreover, had committed none of those cruelties which can neither be forgotten nor be forgiven for generations. The English Republicans left behind them no memories of a Reign of Terror, yet their struggle for half a century, their complete triumph, and their successful government gave the Puritans no lasting hold on national feeling. If the reaction of 1660 drove them from power, the Revolution of 1688 did not restore them to influence. The reign of William III. commenced but thirty years after the death of the Protector, yet the era of the Revolution seems to have been in feeling nearly as far removed as the present age from the feelings of the Commonwealth.

It is curious to contrast in this matter the history of the French and of the English Revolutions. The contrast is the more marked because fickleness is supposed to be characteristic of French sentiment, whilst Englishmen are apt to pride themselves on political constancy. Yet the so-called fickle nation has shown a tenacity of sentiment of which little trace is to be found in the annals of the Puritan Revolution. The French Republic really perished in 1799; it perished, even in name, in 1804; yet in 1830 the Republican party was still alive, in 1848 the Republicans forced themselves into power, and, though the Republic of 1876 is a very different government from the Republic of 1791, there is nevertheless a distinct historical connection between the Republicanism of Gambetta and the Republicanism of the Convention. Napoleon fell from power in 1815, yet in 1848 the glory of the Napoleonic legend had power to raise an unknown adventurer to the Presidency. That Imperialism should have survived Waterloo is nothing. It has risen once more to life from the ignominy of Sedan. The parties, in short, which had their birth in the French Revolution are still alive after the lapse of more than half a century. The Puritans died as a party within thirty years of their highest power. This astonishing fact presents the problem which historians of the Puritan Revolution are bound to explain. As a general rule, they neither recognize the problem nor even suggest its solution. They sometimes, indeed, evade the whole difficulty by the use of lax statements, quite unworthy of serious consideration. Thus Mr. Green, from whose talent and ingenuity something better might be expected, sums up his reflections on Puritanism in these words:

"In the Revolution of 1688 Puritanism did the work of civil liberty which it had failed to do in that of 1642. It wrought out through Wesley and the revival of the eighteenth century the religious reform which its earlier efforts had thrown back for a hundred years. . . . The whole history of English progress since the Restoration on its moral and spiritual side has been the history of Puritanism."

An author who identifies Wesleyanism with Puritanism can easily prove that the failure of the Puritans was in some strange manner identified with the success of their principles. Less brilliant theorists will find in the admitted fact that Puritanism represented some of the most marked traits of English character an additional reason for wondering that the Puritans as a party should not have survived the fall of the Commonwealth. Mr. Gardiner does not write with the brilliant recklessness of Mr. Green, and the 'Puritan Revolution' suggests to careful readers some of the causes to which the failure of Puritanism may be ascribed. It is, however, to be regretted that Mr. Gardiner's studies have directed his attention mainly to the earlier period of the Puritan movement. He accounts completely for the growth of the Puritan power. He certainly does not do more than suggest the grounds on which the permanent decline of Puritanism may be explained.

The main point to be borne in mind is, that in this case, as in the case of all great historical phenomena, it is vain to seek for some one cause of a complicated result. The failure or success of a great movement is always due to a variety of conditions. The Puritan Revolution affords no exception to this rule. The fact that the contest between Protestantism and Catholicism was terminated by the Peace of Westphalia; the fact that the Revolution of 1688 at once relieved the nation from all dread of Roman Catholicism, and the Nonconformists from all intolerable oppression; the absence of all causes of social discontent, and other obvious considerations, must all be taken into account by any critic who wishes to explain the process by which triumphant Puritanism sank into tolerated Nonconformity. But there are one or two special causes for the complete overthrow of the Puritan party which deserve more consideration than they have always received.

It is, in the first place, obvious that the Puritan Revolution affected in

England at least no social change. No large class was created whose interests were bound up with the maintenance of the Commonwealth. The small proprietors of France are as conservative a body as can be found in any country; but the small proprietors of France have, so to speak, been bound over to support, if not the Republic, yet the policy of the Revolution. Their material interests are now indeed secure, but the sentiment with which they still look on the Revolution is probably affected by traditions of the time when the Revolutionists abolished feudalism and relieved the farmers from tithes and corvées. Cromwell's soldiers were, as may be read in Mr. Froude's pages, settled regiment by regiment in Ireland. Had they received lands in England, the course of English history might have been changed. A body of proprietors who held their estates as a gift from Cromwell or the Commonwealth would not easily have acquiesced in the Restoration. The Puritans not only omitted to form a class whose material interests should be bound up with Puritanism, but, further, had the misfortune to rely for support on a class whose influence was on the decline. Small landowners or yeomen formed, it would seem, the backbone of Puritanism; but nothing is more certain than the fact that the relative power and influence of the small freeholders of England have, at any rate since the commencement of the civil wars, generation by generation declined. The power of Puritanism fell together with the influence of the class from which the Puritan movement drew its best recruits. But Puritanism also suffered from moral as well as material causes. Religious fervor was the source of all that was noblest in the Puritan Revolution. Religious enthusiasm is, while it lasts, the greatest force on which any man or party can rely; but the history of the world shows that it is a force which, from its very nature, ebbs and flows. To say this is not to deny either the reality of religious enthusiasm or the importance of the permanent effects which it has produced. A party, however, which relies on enthusiasm must be content to fall as the moral fervor of its supporters declines. If the party is to produce a lasting influence on the world, it must, during the age of faith, either produce a society or effect permanent changes fitted to survive the decline of enthusiasm. This the Puritans did not accomplish. No institution embodied the faith of Puritanism and preserved in England the result of their efforts for future ages. For what is permanent in Puritanism the historian must look rather to the work done in New England than to the results effected at home, either by the Commonwealth or by the Protector.

#### RENAN'S DIALOGUES.\*

"Encore une étoile qui file;  
File, file, et disparaît!"

THIS last production of a writer who at one time seemed, to say the least, the most exquisite literary genius of France, is really sad reading for any one who would gladly be assured that that country is robust and fertile still. It seems to us no less than an example of mental ruin—the last expression of a nature in which the seeds of insincerity and foppishness, which existed at the start alongside of splendid powers, have grown up like rank weeds and smothered the better possibilities. The dialogues which form the only new part of the book are simply priggishness rampant, an indescribable unmanliness of tone compounded of a sort of histrionically sentimental self-conceit, and a nerveless and boneless fear of what will become of the universe if "l'homme vulgaire" is allowed to go on. M. Renan's idea of God seems to be that of a power to whom one may successfully go like a tell-tale child and say: "Please, won't you make 'l'homme vulgaire' stop?" As the latter waxes every day more fat and insolent, the belief in God burns dim, and is replaced by the idea of a kind of cold-blooded destiny whose inscrutable and inhuman purposes we are blindly serving, with at most the relief of making piquant guesses and epigrams as we go about our Master and ourselves.

The dialogues are three in number. M. Renan warns us in his preface not to suppose that any of the speakers represents his confirmed opinion; but this, we take it, means not that he has any other set of opinions more confirmed, but that of these opinions, though they are his best, he is still sceptical. The personages are, as he says, the different lobes of his brain, and, though the word philosophic is on the title-page, we may say that never did a brain express itself in a less philosophic guise—visions taking the place of concepts, and vagueness that of definition. In the first paper, it is laid down as certain that the universe is a fatal mechanism, but no less certain that it has a mysterious final purpose, to which, in spite of ourselves, we are made to contribute. Our virtues and our passions alike undo us as individuals, but they help along the ends of nature:

\* *Dialogues et Fragments Philosophiques. Par Ernest Renan.* Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: F. W. Christman. 1876.



"She dupes us cunningly in view of a transcendent end which she proposes to herself, and which lies completely beyond our sight. . . . Religion is in humanity the analogue of the maternal instinct in the birds, the blind sacrifice of one's self to an unknown end, desired by Nature. . . . To preach to man that he shall not devote himself is like preaching to the bird that she shall build no nest and not feed her young. . . . The fact is that there will always be voluntary victims to serve the universe's ends. . . . Nature acts towards us as towards a troop of gladiators destined to die for a cause which is not their own. . . . And we must not only be voluntary victims, but resigned ones. . . . We see clearly that Nature is a great egoist who deceives us. . . . Man, by the progress of reflection, penetrates more and more her tricks, demolishes by his criticism religion, love, the good, the true. . . . But the great man ought to collaborate in the fraud which lies at the base of things; the finest function of genius is to be the accomplice of God, to connive at the eternal policy, to assist in spreading the traps and nets, to help to deceive individuals for the good of the aggregate, to be the instrument of this grand illusion by preaching virtue to men, while he knows all the time that they shall draw no profit from it. . . . We work for a god as the bee, unconscious, stores his honey for the use of man. . . . Virtue is an obstinate *amen*, said to the dark ends which Providence pursues through our instrumentality."

In the second dialogue an attempt is made to guess at the nature of this dark ideal end. It seems to be *consciousness*, self-knowledge on the part of the universe. Nature is a factory of thought; but as thought of a truly *distingué* order is rare, the expense of means is almost infinitely disproportionate to the object. The *savant*, the philosopher, is what, through all her sidereal systems, Nature is seeking to form. The improbability of his appearing in a perfect form on any given planet is compensated by the eternity of time and the infinite number of chances which the stars afford.

"Philosophy, which is the purpose of creation, lived formerly on the crumbs from the table of princes, who defended it against the universal stupidity and folly. To-day it lives on the crumbs of the world's table. This condition, humble as it is, is better than if philosophers were in the world what they seemingly should be. . . . It is certain that if each individual's place in society were proportioned to his ideal function, Descartes, Newton, Galileo, Huyghens should have been the princes and millionaires of their time. It is not possible to maintain that the services rendered by a banker are proportionate to the services rendered by Linnaeus or Ampère in the ratio of a thousand to one. But when every reflection is made, it appears better that things should be as they are. Even if the earth did belong to us, it would be better to let it be governed by men of affairs, who by their superficiality, their heavy egoism, are preserved from our scruples and our awkwardness. The existence, so useless in appearance, of rich and fashionable people, has more value than may be thought. There must be such people to make horses race, to give balls, and, in a word, to accomplish the vain duties which would fatigue the Wise, and to absorb the dangerous enjoyments which would disturb them. We know not how grateful we should be to those who take the trouble of being rich for us. There is but a small number of brains capable of philosophizing. Toilets, drives in the park, carriages, the opera, and the races devour an activity which might otherwise become noxious. . . . All this noisy stir of the world is needful for a Cuvier, a Bopp, to be left quiet in their rooms, to have good libraries, and not to be tempted or obliged to waste their time in similar vanities. . . . That is why the *savant* willingly bows (not, however, without some little irony) before the man of war and the man of the world."

In the third dialogue we have apocalyptic visions of the actual course of history through future eternity, of which it may be said that none are cheerful, but that all are imaginative on a vast, vague, and original scale. The terrors of the Commune seem really to have organically affected M. Renan's brain, for the clearest and most reassuring image of the future which he allows us to indulge in is that of a league of savants who (when science has become so difficult as to be quite inaccessible to the mass of vulgarians, and is at the same time possessed of unlimited control of natural forces, by means of terrible machines which only a Cauchy or a Laplace shall be able to use) will keep the world in order by mere terror. "On the day," he says, "in which a few privileged children of reason shall possess the means of *destroying the planet*, their sovereignty will be created. This oligarchy will reign by absolute terror, for the existence of all will be in their hands; one may, in fact, call them gods."

How strange it is that the ultimate resort of every Frenchman, struggling with what he conceives to be an adverse destiny, lies in blowing-up something. Whether it be a Commune with the Hôtel de Ville, or M. Renan's "privilegiés de la raison" with the planet, the principle is identical; and it is truly entertaining to see the representative of culture join hands in this way by a secret affinity with his abhorred and dreaded brother with the petroleum can. Fear, mistrust of time and the persuasive force of what is good, seem to be ingrained in the bones of most of the present generation of Frenchmen; and in different ways the only providence they can believe in is a sort of Marshal MacMahon to protect them from their enemies.

The other papers in the volume show the same qualities and defects—

sweetness of diction and delicacy of apprehension in detail, with vagueness, pretension, and deep ignorance of the subject where the subject is the history of philosophic thought. The best excuse one can make for them is that they are but half sincere. But, in a writer of Renan's peculiar pretensions, that is a fatal excuse. In his earlier writings all the suavities and many of the severities of language were employed in painting the distinction between the "âme d'élite," the "esprit honnête," and the common man; how the latter was wedded to superficiality and passive enjoyment, whilst the former found austere "joys of the soul" in the pursuit of wisdom and virtue. These surely imply sincerity. The gifted writer particularly congratulated himself on having preserved the vigor of his soul "dans un pays éteint, en un siècle sans espérance. . . . Consolons nous," he cried, "par nos chimères, par notre noblesse, par notre dédain!" "The true atheist is the frivolous man" is one of his early phrases which has been often quoted. But already in his "Antichrist," published after the Commune, he spoke of the summit of wisdom being the persuasion that at bottom all is vanity; and if this book be really half trifling, he would seem practically to have espoused that persuasion—in other words, to have become a frivolous man, or, according to his own definition, an atheist. Indeed, if one were to seek a single phrase which should define the essence of religion, it would be the phrase: all is *not* vanity. The solace and anæsthetic which lies in the conclusion of Ecclesiastes is good for many of us; but M. Renan's ostentatious pretension to an exquisite sort of religious virtue has debarr'd him from the right to enjoy its comforts. That *esprit vulgaire*, Josh Billings, says that if you have \$80,000 at interest, and own the house you live in, it is not much trouble to be a philosopher. M. Renan, after parading before our envious eyes in fine weather the spectacle of a man *savouring* his *déclin* and enjoying the exquisitely voluptuous sensation of tasting his own spiritual pre-eminence, must not take it hard if we insist on a little more courage in him when the wind begins to blow. We do not know any better than he what the Democratic religion which is invading the Western world has in store for us. We dislike the "Commune" as well as he; but it is a fair presumption that the cards of humanity have not all been played out. And meanwhile, since no one has any authoritative information about the final upshot of things, and yet, since all men have a mighty desire to *get on* if they can, it cannot be too often repeated that they will all use the *practical* standard in measuring the excellence of their brother men: not the man of the most delicate sensibility but he who on the whole is the most *helpful* man will be reckoned the best man. The political or spiritual hero will always be the one who, when others crumbled, stood firm till a new order built itself around him; who showed a way out and beyond where others could only see written "no thoroughfare." M. Renan's dandified despair has nothing in common with this type.

*The Andes and the Amazon; or, Across the Continent of South America.* By James Orton. 3d ed., revised and enlarged. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1876.)—It is pleasant to meet with a book whose brand of "revised and enlarged edition" really means something. Professor Orton's lacks but a few pages of being doubled in size, the new matter consisting of notes of a second journey made, in 1873, across the continent from Pará to Lima and Lake Titicaca. There is no attempt at a continuous narrative, and a popular audience is still kept in view. The resources of the Amazon basin for trade and settlement are set forth in a thoroughly practical way. We learn something about the principal vegetable products, the varieties of timber, even the prices of imported necessities; the cost of travel on the river; the climate and the prevailing diseases. It appears that while the United States takes 45 per cent. of the exports of Brazil, it furnishes but 5 per cent. of the imports—figures almost exactly reversed in the case of Great Britain. Prof. Orton does not urge Amazonian colonization from this country, yet makes the prospect entirely clear for those who are disposed to try their fortunes. Pará he dubs the future Liverpool of the region; Manáos the future St. Louis. "Santarem is of interest to the American reader, as it was selected for colonization by emigrants from the Southern States. Most of the colonists have left, only six families remaining; but these contain nearly all the enterprise and intelligence of the motley party that left Mobile in 1867. These have chosen their plantations on the slopes of the hills six miles south of the city, and are astonishing the Brazilians with the results of their industry." Rubber is to "Amazonia" what gold is to all mining countries. It depopulates whole districts by draining them of their able-bodied men, thus destroying agriculture and raising the price of provisions on the river. The "rubber collectors (*seringueiros*) are the most wretched and shamefully

treated class in America, as the *case triileiros* and miners are on the Andes. They live half the year on the feverish, flooded lands, in palm huts with a raised floor at one end, to which they retire at high water, famishing on farina and fish, and tormented by clouds of mosquitoes, piñms, and motuacs. They are paid in clothing, groceries, and notions at quadruple Pará prices, and by the agents put under obligations *in futuro*, so that they are really slaves." "Under the Brazilian law a laborer cannot leave his employer till his debts are cancelled." The most interesting of the new chapters are those devoted to the trans-Andian railways of Peru, and the excellent medical notes contributed by Dr. F. L. Galt, among which the remarks on dirt-eating will attract attention. Amid much that is quotable from Prof. Orton himself, we select only the following, which will mildly shock admirers of the work in question—a very enjoyable one, by the way, and we suppose not wholly worthless. It ought to be said that in spite of all concealment, the date of Marcey's journey was tolerably manifest from the context, and that the discerning reader early learned to make allowance for his romancing:

"The author of 'A Journey across South America,' which purports to have been recently made, betrays himself by saying that Iquitos consists of only thirty-five huts. Such it was in 1846. This work of 'Paul Marcey,' so capably written and splendidly illustrated, is one of the most remarkable impositions on the literary world. All dates are carefully excluded, and the English translator, Rich, coolly palms it off as a late expedition; whereas it was evidently made up from Count Castelneau's narrative, or by one of his party. The route and main incidents, as the death of Father Bobo, and the dispatch of D'Osey to Lima, are precisely parallel; the views of villages are as they looked thirty years ago; mention is made of the reigning king of France (Louis Philippe); 'Count de la Blanche Epine' is a caricature of Castelneau; and 'Marcey' descended the Amazons in a schooner, which he would not have done after 1853, when steamers were introduced."

*Practical Botany, Structural and Systematic*, etc. By August Koehler, M.D., Professor of Botany in the College of Pharmacy of the City of New York. Copiously illustrated. (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 12mo, pp. 400.)—A neatly worked-up book upon a faulty principle. Nearly all the educational as well as scientific value of botany comes from the natural system; and this means the study of plants in view of their relationships as ascertained from their structure and morphology; it means the association of like things together, the nearer in proportion to the degree of likeness, so that they may throw light upon each other. Artificial keys to the orders, with all their disadvantages and dangers, are a necessity to the beginner, and, when judiciously constructed, a great convenience even to the somewhat advanced student. Beyond the orders there is little call for them, even on the score of convenience and labor-saving, except occasionally and in a purely subsidiary way. But Dr. Koehler's book is all artificial key, of the old dichotomous style (so, or not so, etc.) from beginning to end, not even recognizing natural classes or natural families, or the continuity or sequence of genera. "The author has good authority for believing that he has introduced a method hitherto not applied in American treatises on the science"; but he has not apprehended the reason why—namely, that this is a plan for ascertaining the name of a plant with the least possible expenditure of thought and investigation. It will lead surely and promptly enough to the botanical name, provided no stumbling-blocks happen in the way, but it leads to nothing else. A still readier way, and not much less instructive, is that of receiving the name from the lips of the teacher. All methods have their difficulties and trials.

"The admirable Leisure Hour Series."—NATION.

Catalogues sent on application.

HENRY HOLT & CO., 25 Bond Street, N. Y.

A FULL STOCK OF

*Books in Foreign Languages.*

Subscriptions for Periodicals

SCHOENHOF & MOELLER, Importers and Publishers,  
40 Winter Street, Boston.

Catalogues sent on application.

**BOOKS AT LONDON PRICES.**

Now Ready: Catalogue No. 9 of Rare, Valuable, and Curious Books, free on application.  
JOHN EVANS, Importer, 131 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

**F. W. CHRISTERN,**

FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,

77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

Large assortments of the publications of Charentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Lévy Frères, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Tauchnitz's Collection of British Authors, and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

**FOR** any Book Desired or Information respecting Prices and Editions, address LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., Boston, Mass., who will promptly reply. Books carefully forwarded, post-paid, on receipt of advertised price. Send for catalogue of our own publications.

**WE ARE CONTINUALLY** changing our immense stock of Old, Rare, and Curious Books.

If you visit the Centennial, and want to spend a pleasant hour, call in at Fifth and Walnut Streets, and look over them. And then you can say you have seen the largest collection of old books in America.

LEARY'S OLD-BOOK STORE.

Fifth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia.

The better one may be likened to journeying on foot by daylight, in which toils and labors are well requited by what is seen and learned on the way; the other is travelling by night train, or rather is a groping of the way through a short cut by the light of a single candle, which at best dimly illuminates the passage, and is liable to go out without warning. Still, there are many to whom a work like this may be useful, giving them what they seek or need to know at short hand; and the book appears to be a good one of its kind. "Not what we wish but what we want," is the motto which pupils disposed to learn names rather than botany may inscribe upon the cover of their text-books of a higher aim.

*The Historical Jesus of Nazareth.* By M. Schlesinger, Rabbi in Albany, N. Y. (New York: C. P. Somerby, 1876.)—The origin of Christianity is one of the many important questions which, in our time, numerous scholars have attempted to solve. In the investigations concerning this great problem several Jewish savants have participated. Among them we need but mention Geiger, Grätz, Jost, and Salvador in order to show that they have written on the rise and progress of the early Christian Church, not only in a reverent tone, but also instructively and without any theological bias. The author of the book before us is an American Israelite. According to him, Christianity was the outgrowth of the Messianic idea prevailing in Israel, and he begins, therefore, by tracing this idea from its incipient stages down to the time of Jesus. He then examines the documents in which the beginnings of the Christian religion are recorded. Mr. Schlesinger, of course, refuses to accept the theory that the New Testament is one harmonious whole, but, like Baur and the Tübingen School, he considers it to be made up of independent records—a collection of the writings of several authors of often clashing tendencies of opinion, which the conscientious historian therefore ought to read very carefully and with a critical weighing of their contents. In a third chapter he ventures to state what, in his view, remains to be known of the historical Jesus, and he outlines the inner struggles and often contradictory opinions and ideas of the immediate disciples and followers of Christ, until the Christian Church became independent of the Jewish organism, and was really founded by the master-mind of St. Paul. Rabbi Schlesinger's book is but a small volume, and it does not lay claim to original research or new discoveries; yet it may well be of interest to all who have been born and educated in the Christian faith.

\* \* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

#### BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Arnold (T.), Selections from Addison's Contributions to the Spectator.	(Macmillan & Co.) \$2 25
Broom (H.), Philosophy of Law.	(Hurd & Houghton) 1 50
Campbell (Prof. L.) and Abbott (E.), Sophocles, swd.	(Macmillan & Co.) 90
Dunham (Dr. W. R.), Theory of Medical Science.	(James Campbell) 1 25
Housekeeper's Friend: Cook Book.	(John Wiley & Son.) 1 25
Jevons (W. S.), Logic.	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Johnson (S.), Vanity of Human Wishes, swd.	(Macmillan & Co.) 15
Lange (H.), New German Method. Vol. I.	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 25
Leland (C. G.), Pidgeon-English Sing-Song.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Mahaffy (J. P.), Old Greek Life.	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Majendie (Lady M.), Giannetto: A Novel.	(Henry Holt & Co.) 1 25
Milton (J.), Lycidas, swd.	(Macmillan & Co.) 10
Macaulay (Dr. J.), Plea for Mercy to Animals.	(London)
Merriam (Rev. G. S.), A Living Faith.	(Lockwood, Brooks & Co.)
Richards (J.), Workshop Manipulation.	(E. & F. N. Spon)
Olney (E.), Science of Arithmetic.	(Sheldon & Co.)
Quackenbush (G. P.), Our Language.	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Schlicking (L.), Fire and Flame: A Novel, swd.	(D. Appleton & Co.) 75
Stedman (S. O.), Allen Ray: A Story.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Storrs (Rev. E. S.), Declaration of Independence, swd.	(A. D. F. Randolph & Co.) 75
Saratoga Illustrated, swd.	(Taintor Brothers & Co.) 25
Taylor (Miss), Wise Nun, and Other Tales.	(Kelly, Plet & Co.) 1 25
Wade (D. S.), Clare Lincoln: A Novel.	(Cambridge)
White (J. W.), First Lessons in Greek.	(Ginn Brothers) 1 50

#### Political Headquarters

And Reading Rooms wanting NEWSPAPER FILES, the best, most convenient, and cheapest in the world, send twenty-five cents for SAMPLE FILE and circular by mail to  
ALFRED L. SEWELL, Publisher, Chicago, Ill.

#### Schools.

(Continued from page ii.)

ALEXANDER INSTITUTE. — Military Boarding-School, White Plains, N. Y. Principal, O. H. WILLIS, Ph.D.

ALLEN'S ACADEMY, Chicago, Ill. The most thoroughly equipped Boys' School in the United States. Abie Faculty. In W. ALLEN, LL.D., President.

AMSTERDAM ACADEMY, Amsterdam, N. Y. — Furnishes home for thirty-five young ladies. Very select. Thorough preparation for colleges and scientific schools. Music and Art of the highest grade. Address W. W. THOMPSON, A.M.

BALTIMORE Southern Home School for Young Ladies and Little Girls. Established 1842. Principals: Mr. and Mrs. WILSON M. CARY, Mrs. Gen. JNO. PROGRAM. French the language spoken.



